A DEFENCE OF THE Humble Remonſtrance,

Againſt the frivolous and falſe exceptions of

SMECTYMNVVS.

WHEREIN

The right of *Leiturgie* and *Epiſcopacie* is clearly vindicated from the vaine cavils, and challenges of the ANSWERERS.

By the Author of the ſaid *Humble Remonſtrance.*

Seconded (in way of appendance) with the judgement of the famous Divine of the Palatinate,

D. ABRAHAMVS SCVLTETVS,

Late Profeſſor of DIVINITIE in the VNIVERSITIE of HEIDELBERG:

Concerning the Divine Right of EPISCOPACIE, and the No-right of LAY-ELDERSHIP.

Faithfully Tranſlated out of his Latine.

LONDON,

Printed for NATHANIEL BUTTER in *Pauls* Church-yard at the pyde-Bull neare *St. Auſtins gate.* 1641.

TO THE KINGS MOST SACRED *MAIESTIE*.

Moſt dread Soveraigne;



Our Majeſty was pleaſed to caſt a gracious eye upon a late Humble Remonſtrance, *made to the High Court of Parliament, bemoaning the lawleſſe frequence of ſcandalous Libels, and modeſtly aſſerting the true right of* Liturgie *and* Epiſcopacie. *I little thought that ſo meek and gall-leſſe a Diſcourſe could have irritated any the leaſt oppoſition; But now, I find to my griefe, that even to move for Peace, is*

quarrell enough; and feele many fiſts about my eares, ere I could imagine to have offended. Occaſion is taken from thoſe quiet lines, to combine forces againſt the Cauſe I maintained. The quarrell is inſolently managed by many unknowne hands; Yet, the riot of theſe impotent Aſſailants ſhould not eaſily have drawn me forth, had I not perceived that their confident oſtentation and proud carriage in this affray, hath won them ſome (how undeſerved ſoever) opinion of skill, with their credulous Abettors; and thereby, ſome diſadvantage to my juſt cauſe. As one therefore that hates to betray the truth by an unfaithfull ſilence, I doe cheerfully enter theſe liſts; rejoycing to hope that Your Majeſties Eye may be the Judge and VVitneſſe of my ſucceſſe. Neither ſhall it be diſpleaſing to Your

Ma-

Majeſtie, that Your moſt honourable Peeres, and moſt faithfull Commons, now aſſembled, ſhall ſee the injuſtice, and ungroundedneſſe of that bold Appeale, which was made to them, by my daring Anſwerers; whoſe Abilities I taxe not, but their Fidelity I muſt; as thoſe who have ſought foulely to abuſe their implored Judges with falſe ſhews of miſ-alledged Antiquity, and meerly colourable pretences of proofs: VVhich if I doe not make good to them and the world in this enſuing Diſcourſe, let the blemiſh of reputation lead way to the ſharpeſt cenſure upon the perſon of

Your Majeſties

zealouſly-loyall Subject,

The moſt humble Remonſtrant.

A DEFENCE OF THE Humble Remoſtrance.

Sect. I.

MY ſingle *Remonſtrance* is encountred with a plurall Adverſary that talkes in the ſtyle of *We*, and *Vs*: Their names, perſons, qualities, numbers, I care not to know; But, could they ſay, *My name is Legion, for we are many*; or were they as many Legions as men, my cauſe, yea Gods, would bid me to meet them undiſmaid; and to ſay with holy *David*, *Though an hoaſt ſhould incamp againſt me, my heart ſhall not feare*: The truth of God, which I Pſal. 27. 3.

maintaine, ſhall beare me up againſt the diſcouragements of my confeſſed weakneſſe; In which juſt confidence I doe gladly fly to the Bar of this high and honourable Court, craving no favour but juſtice.

Beſides number, theſe men think perhaps to carry it by bulk; for thoſe that ſpare not to condemne the multitude of my few words, laſh out into ſo tedious an Anſwer, that if I ſhould return them a Reply in the ſame proportion, the Readers eye would be tired with the very proſpect, and his tongue could not but ſay, *Quis leget hæc?* But, though they have had ſo little mercy on him, as to put him to the penance of their long-ſome Volume, I dare not abuſe his leaſure in following them in every ſtep of their looſe and ſuperfluous diſcourſe; but ſhall ſo contract their laviſh ſheets, as that whiles I ſave time, I ſhall not loſe ought of truth.

Acts 17. 22. *Areopagus Mars-hill, or The Court of Areopagites.*

And firſt, theſe brieſe men complaine of the length of my *Preface*; and fetch their grounds afar off, from the admired ſons of Juſtice, the *Areopagi*: The *Areopagi*? who were thoſe? Truly my maſters, I had thought this had been the name of the place, not of the

the men. It is an ill ſigne, they ſay, to ſtumble at the threſhold. And what ſay the admired *Areopagi*, the grave Judges of Athens? They condemne Prefaces, and Paſſion; neither of which can be juſtly charged upon the *Remonſtrance*: For the Paſſion, let any Reader judge, whether ought can be more calmly, more mildly written; and for the Preface, brethren, your cenſure is palpably miſtaken; for that which you miſ-call the *Preface*, is one of the maine pieces of the ſubſtance of that intended Diſcourſe, which was a too juſt complaint of the ſhamefull number of Libels, lately dropped from our lawleſſe Preſſes; A point no leſſe conſiderable, nor leſſe eſſentiall to that propoſed *Remonſtrance*, then thoſe, which your peremptory *Analyſis* makes the only ſubject thereof. I beſeech you brethren, ſpend your Logique upon your own Works, let mine be ſuch as I contrive them.

Thoſe trifling cavils which you are pleaſed to make at ſome phraſes of this miſ-named *Preface*, are not worth notice; It is not for us to run after the ſpending of every mouth: Belike, it angers you, to heare of the honeſty *Branded, and miſlik't, &c.*

of my moderate Paper, out of the conſcience of your own guiltineſſe. Faine would you excuſe that which the world cries ſhame on, the multitude of the late ſeditious Pamphlets; whereat you might well bluſh in ſilence; when an honourable perſon in open Parliament could reckon up no leſſe then ſeven-ſcore, that had paſſed the Preſſe ſince the beginning of this Seſsion.

Pag. 4. Thoſe other verball exceptions are but light froth, and will ſink alone; that ſcum may be worth taking off, which followes; wherein I ſhall deſire all indifferent eyes to judge, whether theſe men doe not endeavour to caſt unjuſt envie upon me, againſt the clear verdict of any knowing mans conſcience: In comparing of Governments of Churches and States, I had ſaid, that if Antiquity may be the rule, the Civill Politie (as in generall notion) hath ſometimes varied, (as that of the ſtate of Rome had done to ſeven ſeverall formes) the Sacred, never. The Civill came from arbitrary impoſers, the Sacred from men inſpired: theſe gracious Interpreters would needs draw my words to the preſent, & particular Government of our

own

owne Monarchie, as if I implyed that to be variable and arbitrary; and are not ashamed to mention that deadly name of *Treason*. Whereas no man that is not wilfully blinde, but sees that I speak of the common forms of Government, that are in the severall States and Dominions in the world, whereof some are ruled by an Aristocracie, others by a Democracie, others by a Monarchie, whether limited, or absolute, others by a mixed form of all these; which were in the first beginnings, in the free arbitrement of their Founders, not aiming at the setled Government of any one Kingdome, much lesse of our owne.

Brethren, whiles you desire to seem godly, learne to be lesse malicious. In the meane time, God blesse all good men from such charity, and our sacred Monarchy from such friends. The forme of the Episcopall Government of the Church hath, contrarily, been ever one and the same, without any considerable variation, and if it have anywhere invaded the Civil administration and yoked Monarchy, it is the insolence of the persons, not the fault of the Calling: And

if *William Rufus*, a Prince noted for grosly irreligious, oppressed by tyrannicall Popish Prelates, did let fall this cholerick word, that he would have the Jews confute them, and that rather then faile, England should turne Jewish, on this condition; Is this an argument for any Christian to use, for the confuting of godly, and loyall Protestant Bishops? which are ready to be censured rather for too great observance of Soveraignty? Let any but a Jew judge, whether this be a fit instance for a Christian. Any thing serves against Episcopacie; The testimony of a Pope, (whom these men honour highly) *Pius* 4. is also brought in as irrefragable, against the Divine right of Bishops. And what sayes Antichrist? He tels the Spanish Ambassador, that his Master, suing for the Councels declaration of this truth, knew not what he demanded; for Bishops so declared, would be exempted frō his Regall power, and as independent as the Pope himselfe. Tell me, brethren, Do ye like, or beleeve this assertion, because a Pope said it? Or can ye blame him (who would have all Episcopall Jurisdiction derived meerly from himselfe) to be unwilling that their

right

right ſhould be yeelded to have the ſame grounds which he pretends for his owne? And if there might be this danger in thoſe Kingdomes where the Clergy challengeth an exemption from the power of all Secularity; why is this enviouſly upbraided to thoſe of ours, who doe gladly profeſſe, notwithſtanding the Apoſtolicall, that is, Divine right of their calling, to hold their places and exerciſe of their Juriſdiction wholly from His Majeſty?

Not leſſe ſpitefull, nor more true, is your obſervation of the compariſon made betweene the indeavours of alteration in our neighbour Church, by our Epiſcopall faction, and that which is now juſtly deſired by the humble Petitioners to the honourable Houſe. It is a foule ſclander to charge the name of Epiſcopacy with a faction, for the fact imputed to ſome few. Fie brethren, are ye Presbyters of the Church of England, and dare challenge Epiſcopacie of faction? Had you ſpoken but ſuch a word in the time of holy *Cyprian*, whom you frequently cite, as a patterne of good diſcipline, what had become of you? Neither is the wrong leſſe, to make

make application of that which was most justly charged upon the practises, and combinations of libelling Separatists, to humble and peaceable Petitioners; the one railing down-right upon an established and holy Government, whom I deservedly censured, the other modestly suing for a reformation of the abuses of Government. Surely, whiles the worst are thus patronized by our indulgent answerers, it is an hard question, Whether the Libellers themselves, or these their mis-zealous Advocates, are more justly to be branded for Incendiaries.

Sect. II.

After this overflowing of your gall, you descend to the two maine subjects of this quarrell, Liturgy, and Episcopacy. I had truly said, that our Liturgy hath been hitherto esteemed sacred, reverently used by holy Martyrs, frequented by devout Protestants, as that which hath been confirmed by Edicts of religious Princes, and our owne Parliamentary Acts. *And hath it so?* say you,

Whence

Whence then proceed ſo many Additions and Alterations, that have changed the face, and fabrick thereof? *Additions* and *Alterations*? What in the preſent Liturgie? where or what? tell me, I beſeech you brethren, are they viſible, or are they not? If not, how come ye to ſee them? if ſo, why cannot we? perhaps ſomewhere in ſtead of *Prieſt*, there is *Miniſter*; perhaps *Abſolution* is interpreted by a *Remiſſion*; perhaps in private baptiſme, there is mention of a *lawfull Miniſter*; perhaps in ſtead of *Purification of women*, there is *Thankſgiving*; And can ye know the Book when ye ſee it again, after theſe *Alterations*, theſe *Additions*? *Is it not now with this miſ-altered Liturgie, as with the diſguiſed Dames, mentioned of old by* D. Hall, (whom you name, I dare ſay, for honors ſake) *ſo miſ-ſhapen by their monſtrous faſhions, that their redivived Grandſires could not now know them*? Can ye but bluſh at this envious and groundleſſe ſuggeſtion?

And why ſhould not I ſpeake of Martyrs, as the Authors and uſers of this holy Liturgie? why ſhould not we glory in their name and Authority? fleight you them as you pleaſe, we bleſſe God for ſuch Patrons of our good cauſe: What a poore returne is

this? Whiles I tell you what our holy Martyrs did, You tell me what one of our Bishops said; As if we were bound to make good every word that falls from the mouth of every Bishop: Even of the best man we may say as the Psalmist doth of *Moses*, *effutiit labiis*, he spake unadvisedly with his lips; As for the words themselves; If a Bishop have said, that our Liturgy hath been so wisely and charitably framed, as that the Devotion of it yeeldeth no cause of offence to a very Popes eare, as onely aiming at an uncontroversory Piety, I see not what hainous fault can herein be imputed to the speech, or the Author: Would you think it requisite that we should chide, and quarrell when we speak to the God of Peace?

It is no little advantage therefore both to our cause and Piety, that our Liturgie is taught to speak severall Languages, both for use and example; and thereby our Church hath gained much justification and honour: As for that sharp censure of learned M^r *Calvins*, *Tolerabiles ineptiæ*, how ever it might well have been forborne by him, *In alienâ republicâ*; and by you, to presse it upon our owne;

we

we honor the name of that noble inſtrument of Gods glory in his Church, yet withall, we fear not to ſay, without any diſparagement to his worth, That our Liturgie both in the frame, and ſurvay of it, paſſed the judgement of no leſſe reverend heads then his owne: Neither would you think it could become any of our greateſt Divines, to meddle with the wafers, or Lords-day markets of his charge; let every Church take care of their own affaires.

As for that unparalleld diſcourſe of mine, concerning the Antiquity of Liturgies; *Unparalleld*, you ſay, *becauſe no man, that you have ſeene, ever drew the line of Liturgie ſo high as I have done*; I muſt tell you, that perhaps there may bee ſome things in the world, that may have eſcaped your not-omniſcient eies, and perhaps this may bee one; I cannot help your wonder, but I ſhall juſtifie my own Aſſertion. In the meane while, ye doe almoſt yeeld the queſtion, ere you argue it; *If by Liturgie* (you ſay) *this Remonſtrant underſtand an Order obſerved in Church aſſemblies, of praying, reading, and expounding the Scriptures, adminiſtration of Sacraments, &c. Such a Liturgie wee*

know, and acknowledge, both Iews and Christians have used; This yeelded, what ſtick you at? That there were preſcribed, and ſtinted formes compoſed by particular men in the Church, and impoſed upon the reſt, this will not down with you; Wherein I cannot ſee, how ye will avoid your own contradiction; For I demand; Is this order of praying and adminiſtration ſet, or no? If it be not ſet, how is it an order? and if it be a ſet order both for matter and form (for you cannot, I ſuppoſe, under the name of *an order*, intend *a meere Table, or Rubrick*) how can it be other, then preſcribed? if the formes were meerly arbitrary, to what uſe was the preſcription of an Order? and, if they were not arbitrary, certainly they were in ſome ſort ſtinted and impoſed.

But what a poore exception is this? that *they were compoſed by ſome particular men*; Was it ever heard that a whole Church together framed a forme of prayer? Can one uniforme expreſsion bee the originall act of many thouſand braines, and tongues? Certainly, ſome one, or few, muſt mold that, which all ſhall both own and uſe. It is a

ſilly

ſilly oſtentation of Antiquity, that theſe men bring againſt theſe preſcribed formes of Liturgie.

Tertullian in his Apol. Chap. 30. ſayes, *The Chriſtians of thoſe times did in their Aſſemblies pray for the Emperour,* * *Sine monitore, quia de pectore*; that is, *not being urged by any ſuperiour injunction, but freely out of the loyall inclination of their owne hearts*: (You miſ-engliſh it, *Without any prompter but their own hearts.*) What is this to a preſcribed forme? Or if they will needs ſo take it, why do they not as well argue, That becauſe our Miniſters doe ordinarily in their Pulpits pray for the King in their own expreſsions, therefore there is no forme of Liturgie injoyned? As for their other teſtimony, it is leſſe to the purpoſe; Who ever denied that ſome things are to be asked according to every mans occaſion? Doe we abridge this liberty by ordaining a publique forme? And if the Lords Prayer be yeelded for an ordinary and ſtinted

* If we may not rather take it to allude to the manner of the Heathens, who becauſe their gods were *multinomines*, according to their ſeverall powers and vertues, had certain monitors to put the ſuppliants in mind of the appellations of their Deities, as *Deſiderius Heraldus* thinks; and to this purpoſe brings that of S. *Auguſtine*, cited out of *Seneca*; as he reads it, *Alius numina Dei ſubjicit*; or as *Lipſius*, *nomina*; however it cannot give the leaſt colour to the ſenſe intended by the Anſwerers.

forme, why not others? Since the oppoſers of ſtinted forms, do, upon the ſame grounds, decrie that alſo. S. *Auſtin* ſayes, it is free to ask the ſame things that are deſired in the Lords Prayer, *aliis atque aliis verbis*, (in other wayes of expreſsion) who ever doubted of it? Yet themſelves will not dare to hold, that * in S. *Auſtins* time, there was no publike Liturgy; this is but to mock the Reader.

Aug.Ep.121

Aug. de bon.perſever.c.22. *Utinam tardi corde ſic audirent diſputationes noſtras ut magis intuerentur orationes noſtras, quas ſemper habuit, & habebit Eccleſia ab exordiis ſuis, uſq; dum finiatur ſeculum.*

If *Iuſtin Martyr* ſaid, that [ὁ προεστὼς] (whom they ſomewhat guiltily tranſlate, The Inſtructer of the people) prayed (as they falſly turne it) according to his ability: It is true; So doe ours, and yet God bee thanked wee have a Liturgie, and ſo had they. Neither is this liberty of pouring out our ſelves in our prayers ever the more impeached by a publique forme, ſince both thoſe may, and doe well ſtand together.

Juſt. Mart. Apol. 2. The words are, ὅσῃ δύναμις: That is, with all intention; and implied in that of the ſame *Juſtin Martyr*, ἀνεκφώνητα κοινὰ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν.

It is ſomewhat magiſterially ſaid by theſe men, that *Set and impoſed formes were not introduced*

duced, till the Arrian and Pelagian hereſies did invade the Church; And as Clerkly doe they immediately confute themſelves, by their owne teſtimonies cited out of the Counceil of Laodicea, which was before their limited time, as being before the Nicene: and betwixt that and the Neoceſarean. Nothing can be more full then the Canon of that ancient Synode, That the ſame Liturgie of prayers ſhould be alwaies uſed both in morning and evening. Yet to mend the matter, *This* (ſay they) *was a forme of a mans owne preſcribing*: Were it ſo, wherein is that the better? But how appears it? By another Canon in a following Counceil, which was the third Counceil of Carthage, *cap.*23. As if Carthage meant to tell what was before done at Laodicea. And what ſay the Fathers at Carthage? That in aſſiſting at the Altar (ſo are their words) the Prayer ſhould be directed to the Father, *& quicunq; ſibi preces aliunde deſcribit*: That is, whoſoever ſhall offer to make uſe of any other form then is preſcribed, ſhould firſt conferre with his more learned brethren: Plainly implying

*Conc. Laod. c.*19. Firſt the prayers of the *Catechumeni* preceded, then thoſe of the Penitents followed, then thoſe of the Faithfull concluded.

ὡσὶ τ τ αὐτὴν λειτυργίαν τ ἐυχῶν πάντοτε, καὶ ἐν τ ἐσπέρας, καὶ τ ἐν ὄρθρῳ γίνεσθαι. *Con. Laod. c.*8

implying the contrary to that, for which the Answerers alledge it, That the usuall and allowed forme was not of his own composing; and his own must not be at his own choise. That of the Milevitane Councell is shuffled up by the Answerers, not with too much fidelity; for where they pretend the onely drift of the Councell to be, That none should use set prayers, but such as were approved of in the Synode, The words of the Councell are full and affirmative, *Placuit ut preces*, It is ordered that the prayers or orisons which are allowed in the Synod, &c. shall be used or celebrated by all men; *nec aliæ omnino dicantur*, and that no other shall be used in the Church, then those, &c. approved in a Synod; adding a sound reason, *ne fortè aliquid, &c.* Lest perhaps something may be composed by them, through ignorance, or want of care, contrary to the Faith.

Concil. Milev. 2. cont. Celest. & Pelag.

Nothing can be more plain then that our Saviour prescribed to his Disciples (besides the rules) a direct form of Prayer, whiles he saith, *Pray thus*: Much of which form I find cited, as of ancient use, out of the *Seder Tephilloth* of the Jews of Portugall, the Antiquity whereof

whereof, as not knowing how I might avow, I expreſſed my ſelfe (within three dayes of the firſt impreſſion) in the ſafe termes of the immediate edition; which theſe men wil not be pleaſed to take notice of, leſt they ſhould find their mouths to be ſtopt before-hand; and ſo they ſhould have loſt their deare quarrell. Howſoever, that it may not ſeeme too ſtrange, that our Saviour ſhould take up the formes, and uſages, that had formerly obtained; ſurely, that he was pleaſed to make uſe, in the Celebration of his laſt, and heaven-by banquet, of both the faſhions, and words which were uſuall in the Jewiſh feaſts, *Caſſander* hath well ſhewed in his *Liturgica*.

The ſet formes of prayer, that were uſed at the *Mincha*, and other the ſeverall occaſions of the Jewiſh ſacrifices, I find ſpecified by learned *Capellus* in his *Spicilegium*, to whom I referre the reader.

In the mean while, ſince they make ſuch wonder of a ſet forme, uſed by Gods people, ever ſince *Moſes* his time, I ſhall give them ſuch a hint thereof, as perhaps they have not heard of before: In the Samaritane Chronicle, now in the hands of the incomparable

Primate of *Ireland*, the Lord Archbiſhop of *Armach*, by him procured out of the Library of the famouſly learned *Ioſ. Scaliger*, thus they ſhall find, After relation of the death of *Adrian* the Emperour (whom theſe Jewes curſe with a *Deus conterat ejus oſſa*) which in their computation falls npon the yeare 4513. from *Adam*; *Quo tempore abſtulit*, &c. At which time ſay they, * he tooke away that moſt excellent book which was in their hands, ever ſince the calme and peaceable times of the Iſraelites, which contained thoſe ſongs, and prayers, which were ever uſed before their ſacrifices; For before every of their ſeverall ſacrifices, they had their ſeverall ſongs, ſtill uſed in thoſe times of peace; all which accurately written, were tranſmitted to the ſubſequent generations, from the time of *Moſes*, (the Legat) unto this day, by the miniſtery of the high Prieſt; This Book, did that high Prieſt embezell, wherein was contained their Genealogies, to the dayes of *Phineas*, together with an hiſtoricall enarration of the yeares of their generation, and life. Then which book, there is no hiſtory beſides the Bookes of *Moſes*, found more ancient

Poſteà mortuus eſt Adrianus (Cujus Deus non miſereatur) obiitque cum luctu magno, &c.

* (*viz.* the high Prieſt then living)

ancient; Thus that ancient Record.

That there were ſuch forms in the Jewiſh Church we doubt not, but that they ſhould be deduced to the uſe of the Church Evangelicall, to ſave the labour of their devotions, is but a poore and groundleſſe requiſition.

Buxtorfius tells us that the Creed of R. Ben Maimon was taken out of the Jews Liturgy.

Thoſe formes which we have under the names of S^t. *Iames*, (who was, as *Egeſippus* tells us, the firſt Biſhop and *Leiturgus* of *Hieruſalem*) of *Baſil*, and *Chryſoſtome*, though they have ſome interſertions which are plainly ſpurious, yet the ſubſtance of them cannot be taxed for other then holy, and ancient: And the implication of the ancient Councell of *Ancyra* is worthy of obſervation, which forbids thoſe Presbyters that had once ſacrificed, προσφέρειν, ὁμιλεῖν, ἢ λειτουργεῖν τὰ τῆς ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν to offer, or to preach, or to ſerve in the holy Liturgies, or adminiſtrations; Howſoever, I perſwade my ſelfe every ingenuous reader finds reaſon and authority enough in this undeniable practiſe of antiquity, to out-face an upſtart conceit, of ſome giddie heads, that condemne all formes of prayer, (be they never ſo holy) becauſe ſuch.

Now what ſhould a man doe with ſuch

ſullen and crabbed pieces as theſe? If he croſſe them in plaine termes, he is falſe? If he comply with them in good words, he Rhetoricates? What have I profeſſed concerning conceived prayers, but that which I ever allowed, ever practiſed, both in private, and publike? God is a free Spirit, and ſo ſhould ours be, in powring out our voluntary devotions, upon all occaſions; Nothing hinders, but that this liberty, and a publique Liturgie ſhould be good friends, and may goe hand in hand together; and whoſoever would forcibly ſever them, let them beare their owne blame. I perceive, this is it which theſe techy men quarrell, and diſlike, that I make the applauſe of conceived prayer, but a vantage-ground to lift up the publique forme of our ſacred Church-Liturgy the higher; which they are indeed loth ſhould ſtand upon even termes, yea above ground, profeſſedly wrangling, firſt, *at the Originall*, then *the confirmation of it*: For the firſt, I had ſaid our Liturgy was ſelected out of ancient modells; including in a parentheſis, [not *Roman*, but *Chriſtian*] and thereby ſignifying (as any ingenuous reader would conſtrue it) that

that our ſaid Liturgie had no relation either to the place, or religion of Rome, but only to the Chriſtian and holy matter of thoſe godly prayers. Now theſe charitable men fly out into high termes, and beſeech your Honours to conſider, *How ye may truſt theſe men, who ſometimes ſpeaking, and writing of the Roman Church, proclaime it a true Church of Chriſt, and yet here, Roman and Chriſtian ſtand in oppoſition.* Ignorantly, or maliciouſly? when any man may ſee here is not an oppoſition meant, but a different modification: As when the Prophet ſayes, *I am a worme, and no man,* Or; the Apoſtle, *It is no more I, but ſin,* Or; *I live, yet not I but Chriſt liveth in me:* Neither is any phraſe more common in our uſuall ſpeech. In what ſenſe we hold the Roman, a true Church, is ſo cleared by the unanimous Suffrages of unqueſtionable Divines, that this iron is too hot for their fingers. Being then thus qualified, our Liturgie needs not be either aſhamed of its originall, (publiſhed in King *Edwards* proclamation) or blankt with their unjuſt aggravation.

The compoſers of it we ſtill glory to ſay, were holy Martyrs, and Confeſſors of the

bleſſed Reformation of Religion; and if any rude hand have dared to caſt a foul aſperſion on any of them, he is none of the Tribe I plead for, I leave him to the reward of his owne merits: Thus compoſed, and thus confirmed by the recommendation of foure moſt religious Princes, and our owne Parliamentary Acts, they dare not abſolutely diſcharge it; but they doe as they may, nibble at it in a double exception, *The one of the over-rigorous preſſing of it, to the juſtling out of Preaching, and conceived Prayer*, which was never intended either by the Law-makers, or moderate Governours of the Church; *The other, that neither our owne Lawes, nor K.* James *his proclamation are ſo unalterable as the Lawes of the Medes & Perſians.* Which bold flout, how well it becomes their gravity, and pretended obedience, we leave at either Bar.

After an over-comprehenſive recapitulation of their exploits in this mighty Section, they deſcend to two main *Quære's*, whereof the firſt is, *Whether it be not fit to conſider of the alteration of the preſent Liturgie*; Intimating herein, not an alteration in ſome few expreſſions, excepted againſt, but a totall alteration in

in the very frame of it, as their reaſons import. Yes doubtleſſe, Sirs, ye may conſider of it; it is none of the Lawes of the Medes and Perſians. What if the weak judgement of K. *James*, upon ſome pretended reaſons, decreed all forbearance of any farther change? What if that ſilly and ignorant Martyr, D^r *Taylor*, could magnifie it to B. *Gardner*, and others, as complete? What if great Elogies and Apologies have been caſt away upon it, by learned men, ſince that time? What if Innovations in Religion be cryed out of, as not to be indured? yet conſider of the alteration: Neither need ye to doubt but that this will be conſidered by wiſer heads then your own, and whatſoever ſhall be found in the manner of the expreſſions fit to be changed, will doubtleſſe be altered accordingly; but the maine fabrick of it, which your reaſons drive at, my hope is we ſhall never ſee to undergo an alteration: Yet ſtill do you conſider of this your projected alteration, whiles I conſider ſhortly of the great reaſons of your conſideration.

Firſt, it ſymboliſeth much with the Popiſh Maſſe: Surely neither as Maſſe, nor as Popiſh: If an holy

holy Prayer be found in a Roman Portuiſe, ſhall I hate it for the place? If I find gold in the channell, ſhall I throw it away becauſe it was ill laid? If the Devills confeſſed Chriſt the Son of God, ſhall I diſclaime that truth, becauſe it paſſed through a damned mouth? Why ſhould we not rather allow thoſe good prayers, which ſymbolize with all Chriſtian piety, then reject thoſe which dwel amongſt ſome ſuperſtitious neighbours?

2 *It was compoſed*, you ſay, *into this frame, on purpoſe to bring Papiſts to our Churches.* Well, had it been ſo, the project had been charitable, and gracious. What can be more thank-worthy, then to reclaime erring ſoules? *But it failed in the ſucceſſe.* Pardon me, brethren; if it had done ſo, it was neither the fault of the matter, or of the men, but it did not: Sir *Edward Coke* can tell you, that till the eleventh year of Qu. *Elizabeth*, all came to Church: Thoſe times knew no Recuſant then: At laſt, the Jeſuitiſh Caſuiſts, finding their great diſadvantage by the inoffenſive uſe of our Liturgie, determined it utterly unlawfull to joyne in Church-ſervice with Heretiques. Hence came this alienation, hence this diſtraction, that we have

In his ſpeech at Norwich Aſſizes, publiſhed.

not

not won more; it is not the fault of our publique devotion, why do you not impute it to the want, or weakneſſe in preaching rather? But that our Liturgy hath loſt any to the Popiſh part, it is not more paradoxe then ſclander.

Thoſe ſtumbling blocks which you ſay our Liturgie laies before the feet of many, are by many removed, and amongſt the reſt, by a blind man, whoſe eie-leſſe head directed how to avoid thoſe blocks, which theſe quick-ſights will needs ſee how to ſtumble at. But if there be found ought that may indanger a ſcandall, it is under carefull hands to remove it. 3. *M. Fiſher.*

It is Idoliz'd, they ſay, *in England*; they meane at *Amſterdam*; ſome Separiſts have made it ſuch; never any juſt Proteſtant: Others ſay rather that too many doe injuriouſly make an Idoll of preaching; ſhall we therefore conſider of abandoning it? and if ſome one have paſſed an hyperbolicall praiſe of it, muſt it therefore be marred in mending? 4.

Multitudes of people (they ſay) *diſtaſt it*; more ſhame for thoſe that have ſo miſtaught 5.

them; (would God too much multitude did not, (through ill teaching) diſtaſt the truth of wholſome doctrine, and abhorre Communion with the true Church of Chriſt) ſhall we to humour them, abandon both?

6 *There is a vaſt difference*, (they ſay) *betweene it and the Liturgies of all other reformed Churches*. A difference? wherein? not in the eſſentiall points, but in ſome accidents, and outward formalities; Whoſe fault is that? ours was before theirs; why did not they conforme to us; rather, then we come back to them? I may boldly ſay, ours was, and is the more noble Church; and therefore more fit to lead, then to follow: But indeede ſince our Languages, and Regions are different; what neede is there, our Liturgies ſhould be one? and why ſhould we be more tyed to their formes, then thoſe of all other Chriſtians, Grecians, Armenians, Cophs, Abaſſine, Arabian, Egyptian? all which differ in no leſſe from each other, then we from them: Conſider now, brethren, whether theſe reaſons of a change be worthy of any conſideration.

The

The ſecond *Quære* is ſo weak, that I wonder it could fall from the pens of wiſe men; *Whether the firſt reformer of religion did ever intend the uſe of a Liturgie, further then to be an helpe in the want, and to the weakneſſe of the Miniſter*; Brethren, can ye thinke that our Reformers had any other intentions then all other the founders of Liturgies, through the whole Chriſtian, yea and Jewiſh Church? the leaſt part of whoſe care was the help of the Miniſters weakneſſe, and their main drift the helpe of the peoples devotion; that they knowing before-hand, the matter, that ſhould be ſued for, and the words wherewith it ſhould be clothed, might be the more prepared to joyn their hearts to the Miniſters tongue, and be ſo much more intent upon their devotion, as they had leſſe need to be diſtracted with the doubtfull expectation of the matter, or words to be delivered.

It is no leſſe boldly then untruly ſaid, that *all other Churches reformed, though they uſe Liturgies, doe not bind their Miniſters to the uſe of them*; [Binding] is an ambiguous word; I am ſure both the French, and Dutch,

I beſeech you tell me brethren, how you conſtrue thoſe words of *Calvin* which he wrote to the Protector of England. *Anno* 1548.

Oct. 22. Quod ad formulam precum & rituũ Eccleſiaſticorum, valde probo ut certa illa extet à qua paſtoribus diſcedere non liceat in functione ſua; tam ut conſulatur quorundam ſimplicitati & imperitiæ, quam ut certius ita conſtet omnium inter ſe eccleſiarum conſenſus; poſtremo etiam, &c. That is, As for a forme of prayers, and of rites Eccleſiaſticall, I do greatly approve that there be a certain one extant, from which it ſhould not be lawfull for the Miniſters in their function to depart: both that by this meanes proviſion may bee made for the ſimplicity, and unskilfulneſſe of ſome, and the conſent of all Churches amongſt thẽſelves may more certainly appeare; Laſtly, that thus there may be a remedy for the deſultory levity of ſome men that affect ſtill certain innovations; as I have ſhewed that the Catechiſme it ſelfe ſerves for this purpoſe. So therefore there ought to be a ſet forme of Catechiſme, a ſet form of adminiſtration of Sacraments, and of publique Prayers.

Churches (in both which I have been preſent) require their preſcribed formes, to be uſed both in Baptiſme, and in Celebration of the Lords Supper, and in ſolemnization of Matrimony: And in what rank will they place the Lutheran Churches? And if the Reformed Churches uſe this liberty, what a poore handfull are they to that world of Chriſtian Churches abroad, which do both uſe and injoyn their Liturgie, in that firſt forme we have ſeen urged in the Melevitane Councell?

2. *Edwards* booke is miſ-conſtrued, which only The Rubrick in King out of reſpect to the peoples eaſe, and their more willing addiction to the hearing of Sermons, (which were then ſo much more long as they were more rare) gave that liberty

ty to Miniſters in the uſe of the Liturgie; which divers Ordinaries at this day (upon my certain knowledge) have often yeelded unto: That Rubrick imports no more then our practiſe; neither of them diſparages our Liturgie.

3. *The Homilies are left free* (they ſay) *to be read or not, by preaching Miniſters; why not then the Liturgie? And if it can be thought no leſſe then ſacriledge to rob the people of the Miniſters gift in preaching, and to tie him to Homilies, it can be no leſſe to deprive them of their gift in Prayer.* Did we utterly abridge all Miniſters of the publique uſe of any conceived Prayer, on what occaſion ſoever, the argument might hold force againſt us; but, that being yeelded, our Liturgie is untouched: Neither were it a leſſer ſacriledge to rob the people of a ſet forme, by the liberty of a free expreſsion: And how doth this argument more ſtrike us then all the Churches of the Chriſtian world, whoſe preaching is out of their conception, whiles their Liturgie is injoyned?

4. It is a falſe ground, that the impoſing of the Book ties godly men from exerciſing their gift in Prayer: An enjoyned Liturgie

may well ſtand with the freedome of a Prayer conceived: The Desk is no hinderance to the Pulpit: He is wanting to his duty, that ſlackneth either ſervice.

Much leſſe can this be any reaſon to keep men from their preſence at our Church-ſervice, that a Liturgie is impoſed. Tell me, Is this Liturgie good or evill? If it be evill, it is unlawfull to be uſed; If good, it is not unlawfull to be impoſed: And were the impoſition amiſſe, what is that to the people? It is impoſed upon the Miniſter; that whether act, or paſsion reſts in him, the people are no more concerned in it, then if a Miniſter ſhould tye himſelfe to the uſe of a Prayer of his owne making, (as I have knowne ſome of the moſt famous Divines of this Kingdome conſtantly do:) If then there be no way left to recover the people to a ſtinted Prayer but by leaving it free to uſe, or not to uſe, O miſerably miſ-led people, whom nothing belike, can reclaime, (after ſuch doctrine inſtilled) but a profeſſed confuſion! Well may they object to themſelves in this way, diviſions and diſturbances, following upon a perfect deformity; and ſooner may they object

then

then avoid them. *But why more here* (they ſay) *then in other Reformed Churches?* The difference is evident, Our Churches have never been but uſed to a ſetled Liturgie, which the eares and hearts of our people look for; Theirs, perhaps, began without it: Yet ſo, as I doubt not but if any man ſhould now refuſe to conforme to their eſtabliſhed formes, hee ſhould ſoon feele the dint of their cenſures. The like anſwer ſerves for their objected Homilies: Surely were they enjoyned to all, by lawfull authority, and made ſo familiar to the eares of every congregation, as the Liturgie is, ſome few could not forbeare them without offence; whiles withall, they ſhould be allowed the helps of preaching: As in this caſe it is done, the uſe of the ſet Liturgie being ſeconded by prayers conceived. But the project is ſingular, *That if any Miniſters ſhould prove inſufficient to diſcharge the duty of Prayer in a conceived way, it may be impoſed upon him as a puniſhment to uſe ſet formes, and no other.* Never Confeſſor injoyned ſuch a penance; Never Law-maker impoſed ſuch a mulct: Certainly it were a more juſt and needfull motion, that many who take upon them to preach,

(with

(with ſo ſmall abuſe of Gods ſacred Word) might (as in way of correction) be injoyned onely to reade Homilies: But who ſees not in this overture, an utter caſſation of that Liturgie which is pretended to be left free? For if the freedome of a ſole conceived prayer ſhall depend upon the ſuppoſed ſufficiency of the Miniſter, ſhew me the man amongſt five hundred of the forward Artizans, that will confeſſe, or think himſelfe inſufficient for the act, or unfurniſhed with the gifts of Prayer. Away then with the Book, whiles it may be ſupplied with a more profitable nonſenſe. Surely, where God hath beſtowed gifts, it is fit they ſhould be imployed, and improved to the beſt advantage of his people: But where there is nothing but an empty over-weening, and proud ignorance, there is great reaſon for a juſt reſtraint.

SECT. III.

THus their cavils concerning the Liturgie are vaniſhed, we deſcend to the longer quarrell of Epiſcopacie: Where it is their

ill

ill hap to ſtumble again at the entring into theſe Liſts: beginning their anſwer (pardon good Reader) with a manifeſt leaſing, whiles they dare ſay, that *whatſoever hath been either ſpoken, or written by any, either learned Divines, or well reformed Churches, is taxed by me, as no other then the unjuſt clamours of weak, or factious perſons*: Certainly, had I done ſo, I had been no leſſe worthy to be ſpit upon, for my ſaucy uncharitableneſſe, then they are now for their uncharitable falſhood: After my complaints of the many railing invectives, and ſcandalous Libels publiſhed of late, I came now to bemoane my ſelf to that high Court of Juſtice, in theſe words; "As for that "forme of Epiſcopall government which "hath hitherto obtained in the Church of "God, I confeſſe I am confounded in my "ſelfe to heare with what unjuſt clamours "it is cried down abroad, by either weak or "factious perſons; *Abroad* (I ſay) in relation to both Houſes, leſt any malicious perſon ſhould have traduced my words, as reflecting upon any free ſpeech, made in either of them, againſt ſome of that calling, alluding to that impious licentiouſneſſe of our

frequent Libellers, both in the City and Countrey, which ſhamefully revile Epiſcopacy, as wicked and Antichriſtian; Now come theſe brotherly ſlanderers (ſure the termes can be no better) and would needs Wier-draw my words as farre as France, Germany, or Geneva it ſelf; and cry out of my Arrogancy; as condemning all Divines, all Churches; which the God of heaven knowes never came within the verge of my thoughts; Yea, if I could have been ſo abominably preſumptuous as to inlarge my [*abroad*] to other Nations; yet I beſeech you, readers, ſee how well this follows; Epiſcopall Government is with unjuſt clamours cryed down abroad, by either weake or factious perſons, therefore, whoſoever ſpeaks or writes againſt Epiſcopacy, is either weake or factious: Brethren, if you have any remainders of modeſty, or truth, left in you, cry God mercy for this egregious and palpable calumnie.

Quanquam deſceſſu veteris confuſus amici, Juvenal.

Of the ſame ſtraine is their witty deſcant upon my *confoundedneſſe*; I made uſe of the phraſe, as that which is taken up by the moſt elegant Greek and Latine Authors, to expreſſe

preſſe extreame ſorrow, theſe deep Philologers, (as not ſeeming to know other ſenſe) take it of a confoundedneſſe, through diſtraction; *ſure the man is not in his right wits:* Μῶροι, μανόμεθον ἀγόμεθα; And how ſo, trow we? *Heare how he raves; He talks of all peaceable and right affected ſons of the Church, and craves an admittance in all their names, whereas all could not take notice of his book; doubtleſſe a deep phrenſie;* Brethren, I am ſtill, and ſhall ever be thus ſelfe-confounded, as confidently to ſay, that he is no peaceable, and right affected Son of the Church of England, that doth not both hate Libels, and wiſh well to Liturgy and Epiſcopacy, both which ſumme up my humble Remonſtrance.

But this ſlip, they confeſſe, is ſmall, that other is worthy of a large Dos of Ellebore; that I ſay, *Epiſcopall government, that is, government by Dioceſan Biſhops, derives it ſelfe from the Apoſtles times; this* (they ſay) *they cannot but rank amongſt my notorious*——ſpeake out Maſters; I would not have that word ſtick in your teeth, or in your throat; And why is this truth ſo notorious; *Becauſe there were no Dioceſans of above an hundred yeares after Chriſt.*

Now Readers, I beſeech you, caſt back your eies upon thoſe Lines of mine, and ſee, whether I make any mention at all of Dioceſans, but onely of the ſacred government by Epiſcopacy; Wanton wits muſt have leave to play with their owne ſtern; Brethren, what needs this importunity? Even ſelfe-confounded men doe not alwaies ſpeake falſe; What the joynt-confeſsion of all reformed Divines is concerning the derivation of Epiſcopacy from the Apoſtolique times, I have elſewhere ſhewed from ſome, in the name of all; and ſhall doe again in the due place; to what purpoſe were this unſeaſonable anticipation? Indeed no true Divine did ever hold otherwiſe: The queſtion never was, Whether Biſhops were derived from the Apoſtles, But what kinde of Biſhops they were; For us, if we not deduce ours from them in reſpect of all the eſſentialls of our calling, let the ſhame be ours. Whereas I ſay the government hath continued without any interruption, they aske jeeringly, *What at Rome?* and tell me of ſome places of the world, as *Scotland* for example, wherein this government was never known for many years

years together. Brethren, what means this, whether ſimplicity, or ſcorne? Could ye imagine me to meane, that every place through the whole world hath had a continued Line of Biſhops ever ſince the Apoſtles? ſure you cannot ſo wrong your own judgements; Alas, we could tell you of *China*, *Iapan*, *Peru*, *Braſil*, *New-England*, *Virginia*, and a thouſand others, that never had any Biſhops to this day: Yet it is never the leſſe ſafe to ſay, that the forme of Government by Biſhops in the Chriſtian world, derives it ſelfe (without interruption) from the Apoſtles times, for as much as there hath been no time, or age ſince them, wherein there hath not been this forme of Epiſcopall Government continued. You tell me, that *In ancient times the Scots were inſtructed by Prieſts, and Monks, and were without Biſhops two hundred and ninety years*. I acknowledge the words of *Iohannes Major*, I wiſh they had not been without, either before, or ſince; but what is this to my aſſertion? There could be no interruption of that, which had as yet no being: neither did I ever ſay, that Biſhops were every where.

You come to *England*, there you think to have me sure; you desire to know of the Remonstrant, *Whether God had a Church in England in Q. Maries dayes or no?* And *if so, who were then Bishops?* Sure, brethren, you cannot be so ignorant as you make your selves; Have you not seen M^r *Foxes* Acts and Monuments? Have you not seen M^r *Fr. Masons* Vindication of our succession? Or doe ye make no difference betwixt an intermission and an interruption? Doe ye not know that even the See of Rome, (which would faine boast of a known succession) hath yet been without a Bishop longer then the whole raigne of Qu. *Mary*; if we may beleeve *Damasus* himselfe, after *Marcellinus*, for 7. years, 6. moneths, and 25. daies? And if after the Martyrdome of our Orthodoxe Bishops, revolted, or Popish governors held those Sees, they were corrupt in their places, judgement, and practise; there was not an utter abolition of their calling, which their repentance restored to its first vigour. Where I justly aver this continuance to have been without the contradiction of any one congregation in the Christian world, you vainly think to choak me with a

story

ſtory from our own darling, *Heylin*, which tels us of the furious violence of the people of Biſcay againſt the Biſhop of Pampelona, reported alſo by the Spaniſh hiſtory: to which you referre us; concealing yet, that which the ſame hiſtory relates, that this was done upon ſome attempts and wrong conceived to be offered them by the Clergy.

A goodly inſtance, and fit for the gall of your inke, and as good a conſequence. The Biſcainers upon a private quarrell are enraged againſt the perſon of their Biſhop, & for his ſake (for the time) againſt his fellowes; therefore ſome Chriſtian Congregation denies the ſucceſsion of Epiſcopall Government, from the times of the Apoſtles. Of the like validity and judgement is your inſtance of French, Scotiſh, and Belgick Churches: Who doubts of either their Chriſtianity, or their contradiction to Epiſcopacy? But if you did not wilfully both ſhut your own eies, and endeavour to blind the eies of your Reader, you could not but ſee, that I limit the time untill this

You might as well have told us out of the ſame Author, of the ſtrange conditions that are in uſe amongſt them, which they impoſe upon their King, if ever he come into their coaſt; of his riding with one leg bare, and their mocking of him with their *Maravedis*.

this present age. Good brethren, whiles you object bold falshood to me, learn to make some conscience of truths. To let passe your untrue suggestions concerning my assertion, of one and the same forme of Prayer continued from *Moses* to the Apostles, and by the Apostles, &c. I cannot but wonder with what face you can reckon it amongst my untruths, that Episcopall Government hath continued in this Iland, ever since the first plantation of the Gospel. I challenge you before that awfull Bar, to which you have appealed, name but one yeare ever since Christianity had footing in England, (which was under the British or Roman Government) wherein there were no Bishops in this Land; If you can name neither yeare nor Author, be ashamed to say this truth hath had any contradiction, or else I hope the Readers will be ashamed of you. What a poore shift is it to tell me of the contradiction that Episcopacie hath had since the Reformation? I can tell the world that your selves oppose it; what of that? You mislike the Government, you cannot deny that it hath so long continued, so as my assertion continues inviolable,

ble, that the form of this government hath, without contradiction, continued here ever ſince the firſt plantation of the Goſpel.

The man runs on ſtill, you ſay, *and as thinking to get credit to his untruths by their multiplication, dares boldly ſay, that except all Hiſtories, all Authors faile them, nothing can be more certaine then this truth*: and here you cry out, *Os durum!* and aggravate the matter enviouſly, by the inſtance of Divine truths, concerning the maine points of our holy Creede: But, good ſirs, doe ye bethink whom you ſpeake to? Could you ſuppoſe to meete with ſo meane readers, as ſhould not know that no phraſe is more ordinary in our hourly diſcourſe, then this; when we would cõfidently affirme any truth, to ſay, It is ſo true as nothing can be truer? Not to enter into any metaphyſicall diſcourſe concerning the being, or degrees of truth, (wherein ſome that would be wiſe, may perhaps have loſt themſelves) would any man think it reaſonable, that upon ſuch an ordinary and familiar aſſertion he ſhould be called to account for the articles of his Creede, and be urged to compare his truth with Gods? Away with this witleſſe and

Yet the words of the Remonſtrance are not, *nothing can be a more certain truth*, but, *nothing can be more plain then this truth.*

malicious intimation: Pardon me Readers, that I have ſpent ſo much time and paper, in following theſe triflers ſo cloſe; their uncharitable ſuggeſtious drew me on, Judge yee now whether of us have more juſt cauſe of indignation.

Sect. IIII.

HItherto they have flouriſhed, now I hope they will ſtrike; againſt the Libellers importune projects of innovations, I urged that were this Ordinance meerly humane, or Eccleſiaſticall, if there could be no more ſaid for it, but that it is exceeding ancient, of more then 1500. years ſtanding, and in this Iland of the ſame age with the Goſpell it ſelf, this might be a juſt reaſon to make men tender of admitting a change; an argument which I ſeconded with ſo rationall inforcement, as will I doubt not prevaile with all unpartiall judgements: Now my witty Anſwerers tell me this is an *argumentum Galeatum* (and that the Reader may know they have ſeen a Father, cite *Hierome*, who gave that title

title to a Prologue, but never to an argument) and as if arguments were Almanacks, tell us, *It was Calculated for the Meridian of Epiſcopacy, and may indifferently ſerve for all Religions.* Truly brethren, you have not well taken the height of the Pole, nor obſerved a juſt zenith; for could you ſay ſo much for the Presbyteriall government, had it continued here ſo long, I ſhould never yeeld my vote to alter it; an uninterrupted courſe of ſo many years ſhould ſettle it ſtill: So as you are plainly deceived, the argument is not calculated for the Meridian of Epiſcopacy; but for whatſoever government; if ſo long time have given it peaceable poſſeſsion, there had need to be ſtrong reaſons of Law, for an ejection; But that it may ſerve for all Religions, it is but an envious ſuggeſtion; unleſſe you adde this withall, ſave where the ground of the change is fully convictive, and irrefragable; in which cauſe both the mouthes of Jews, and Heathens, and Papiſts, and your own may be juſtly ſtopped.

As for that overworne obſervation of *Cyprian*, that our Saviour ſayes, *I am the way, the truth, and the life*; but doth not ſay, *I am cuſtome*,

it is no leſſe plauſible then uſefull, but if wee regard ſoundneſſe of ratiocination, it is an Illuſtration meerly negative: ſo we may ſay, hee ſaith not, I am reaſon, I am experience, I am authoritie; and yet authoritie, experience, reaſon are worthy to ſway with us, in all matters of queſtion: and withall, Hee that ſaid, *I am the way*, ſaid, *that the old way was the good way*: and if Cuſtome without Truth (as that Father ſaid well) be nothing but a gray-hair'd Error; or, as Sir *Francis Bacon* wittily, Antiquitie without Truth is a Cipher without a Figure; yet where Cuſtom & Antiquitie are backed with Truth, there they are Figures multiplied with many Ciphers.

As for the time wherein their learned Ancients affirme, The Church not to have beene governed by Biſhops, but by Presbyters, and for the difference pretended to be betwixt the Primitive Biſhops and ours, wee ſhall meet with it in ſuch due time and place, as ſhall be juſtly occaſioned: What needs this frivolous waſte of unſeaſonable words? wherewith unleſſe theſe men deſired to ſwell up this their windy bulke, why doe they tell us yet againe, of that already anſwered, and

ground-

groundleſſe exception; againſt both their owne eyes, and conſcience; where I ſay, that this government hath continued in this Iland; ever ſince the plantation of the Goſpel without contradiction; when as they cannot name any man in this Nation that ever contradicted Epiſcopacie, till this preſent age, or that ever contradicted this truth, that Epiſcopacy hath ſo long continued in this Iland; which is the only drift of my words; For alas, could I be ſo ſimple as not to know that this age hath bred oppoſition enough to the preſent government? could I doubt whether theſe very men oppoſe it? Yet, let the boldeſt forehead of them all denie that it hath continued thus long in this our Iland, or ſay that any till this age contradicted it; ſo as that my aſſertion is juſt, their exception falſe, and vain: As for that ſupplie of acceſſory ſtrength, which I did not beg, but raiſe & evince from the light of nature and rules of juſt policie, for the continuance of thoſe things, which long uſe and many laws have firmly eſtabliſhed, as neceſſary, and beneficiall; it will ſtand long enough, againſt the battery of their Paper-pellets; If ſome ſtatute Laws,

which seemed once necessary, and beneficiall, proving afterwards, in processe of time, noxious and burthensome, have been justly, and wisely repealed; Let them tell mee, whether the fundamentall Lawes of the Kingdome, upon any mans abuse, may be subject to alteration, or whether rather their Wisdomes would not think fit to determine that the Laws must stand, and the abuses be removed; such is the cause we have now in hand, and if we shall goe lesse: I speak not against an impossibility, but an easinesse of change, the question being so stated (which their guiltinesse would willingly over-look) that things indifferent, or good, having been by continuance and generall approbation well rooted in Church and State, may not upon light grounds be pulled up.

Sect. V.

I Justly fetch the pedegree of our holy calling from no lesse then Apostolicall (and in that right, Divine) institution, and prove it from the clear practise of their immediate succes-

ſucceſſors, and juſtly triumph in that confidence. They tell me of one ſcruple yet remaining; It is well, if there be no more: And what may that be? *That in Originall authority of Scripture, Biſhops and Presbyters went originally for the ſame.* Alas, brethren, what needed this to be a ſcruple in your thoughts, or your words, when it is in expreſſe termes granted by us? That there was at firſt a plain Identity in their denomination; here is one page, and that not without ſome labour of proofs, idly loſt.

It is true, that the Remonſtrant undertakes to ſhew a cleare and received diſtinction of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, (out of the undeniable writings of thoſe holy men, which lived in the times of the Apoſtles, and after them) with an evident ſpecification of their ſeverall duties: And what ſay my Anſwerers to this? Yet, ſay they, *Let us tell him, that we never finde in Scripture theſe three Orders, Biſhops, Presbyters, Deacons.* Brethren, ye might have ſpared to tell me that which I had told you before: I ſpeak of the monuments of immediate ſucceſſion to the Apoſtolique times; Ye, of the writings of the

Apoſtles

Apoſtles themſelves: How then doe you either anſwer, or oppoſe my aſſertion? Although I muſt alſo tell you, that though in the Apoſtolique Epiſtles there be no nominall diſtinction of the titles, yet there is a reall diſtinction and ſpecification of the duties, as we ſhall ſee in due place.

That ye may ſeem not to ſay nothing, and may make your Readers beleeve you are not quite forſaken of Antiquity, ye call *Hierome*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Theophylact*, *Irenæus*, and *Cyprian*, to the Book: And what evidence will they give for you? That the names of Biſhops and Presbyters were not at firſt diſtinguiſhed, but uſed ἀδιακρίτως, in a promiſcuous ſenſe, and that ſome ſucceeding Biſhops of Rome were ſtyled Presbyters; This is all: but that your trifling may appeare to all the World, Name but any one of our Writers, who have hitherto ſtood up in the cauſe of Epiſcopacie, that hath not granted and proclaimed this which you contend for: Although withall, let me tel you, that you could not have brought a ſtronger argument againſt your ſelves: for hence the world ſhall ſee how little force can be drawne from the name to the thing, ſince the

the mentioned *Anicetus*, *Pius*, *Hyginus*, *Teleſphorus*, Biſhops of Rome, are ſo famouſly known to have been in an height of elevation above Presbyters; And ſince *Cyprian*, who is ſtyled by his Presbyters, *Frater*, is never found to ſtyle his Presbyters, Biſhops; And being an holy Biſhop himſelfe, in many Epiſtles, ſtifly maintaines the eminence of his ſuperiority; And is ſome-whiles honored with the title of *Beatiſſimus Papa Cyprianus*, which I ſuppoſe was never given to a meere Presbyter: But what do I here follow them who confeſſe themſelves out of the way? At laſt acknowledging, that their adverſaries confeſſe, that which they would needs ſpend time to prove; let the names paſſe; All the queſtion is of the diſtinction of their offices, which they wil follow as tedioufly as looſly.

And firſt they would faine know what we make the diſtinct office of a Biſhop, wherein they fall ſomewhat unhappily, upon the very words of that branded *Ærius*; *Is it*, ſay they, *to edifie the Church by Word & Sacraments? Is it to ordaine others to that worke? Is it to rule, to governe by admonition, and by other cenſures? any, or all of theſe belong unto the Presbytery.*

Compare now the words of *Ærius*, as they are related by *Epiphanius*, whom that Father brings in ſpeaking thus, concerning Epiſcopacy and Presbytery, *There is one order of both, one honor, one dignity; the Biſhop impoſeth hands, ſo doth the Presbyter; the Biſhop doth adminiſter Gods worſhip or ſervice, ſo doth the Presbyter; the Biſhop ſitteth on the throne, ſo doth alſo the Presbyter*: See reader and acknowledge the very phraſes of that man, whom holy antiquity cenſured even in this point both for a frantick man, and an hereticke; Brethren, God ſpeed you well with your Queſtion; As for the firſt, which is edifying the Church by Word, and Sacraments, we make no difference, your diſtance may; we both hold it our worke and make it ſo; and if any one have beene ſlack herein, the fault is perſonall, we neither defend, nor excuſe it. The maine quarrell you grant to be in the ſecond, which is the power of Ordination; impropriated (as you enviouſly and untruly ſpeake) to our ſelves: This you ſay was in former times in the hands of the Presbyters, and undertake to prove it from 1 Tim. 4.14. *Neglect not the gift which was given thee by Propheſie, and by laying on the*

ἐμβεβλῆθαι τὰς χεῖρας. Epiph.

the hands of Presbytery, a place that hath receiv ed anſwer μωμωμεκίς; which I wonder ye can ſo preſſe, when *Calvin* himſelfe, (as you well know) in his learned Inſtitutions, even in his laſt, and ripeſt judgement, conſtrues it quite otherwiſe; taking it of the office, and not of the men; (however elſewhere otherwiſe) wherein he alſo followes the judgement of *Ierome*, *Primaſius*, *Anſelme*, *Haymo*, *Liranus*, *Eraſmus*, and others; as our learned Biſhop *Downam* hath largely ſhewed.

To countenance this ſenſe of yours, you tel us, *you find* πρεσβυτέρους, *ſo taken in Scripture*; and cite *Luc.* 22.66. and *Act.* 22.5. Wherein you do meerly delude the reader; you find indeed the Elders of the people ſo called, but the Elders of the Church never; to make good your own conſtruction therefore, you muſt maintaine that *Lay-men did and muſt lay on hands in Ordination*, which *Calvin* himſelf utterly abominates.

Neither need we to give any other ſatiſfaction to the point, then that which we have from S. *Paul* himſelfe, 1 *Tim.* 3. 6. *Stirre up the gift of God which is in thee by the impoſition of my hands*; mine, not others: I aske then, Was *Timothy* ordained more then once? once ſure-

ly S. *Pauls* hands were laid upon him, when therefore the Presbyters? *Yes*, you say, *this was a joynt act of both, else the Harmony of Scripture is not maintained*; Pardon me Brethren, if I think Mr. *Calvin* was more skilled in the harmony of Scripture then our selves, yet in his eare it sounded well, that πρεσβυτέριον, should be the Office to which *Timothy* was ordained by *Paul*, and not a company of men that ordained him; Yet give me leave to marvell how you can have the boldnesse to say, *This power is communicated to Presbyters*, when you know that not onely other Antiquity, but even *Hierome* himself and that Councell of *Aquisgrane* which you cite, doe still except Ordination, which yet we doe not so appropriate, as to lay our hands alone upon the head of any Presbyter.

The third part of our office consists in Ruling; *which though our Bishops* (you say) *assumed to themselves, you will discover to have bin committed to, and exercised by Presbyteriall hands.* For evidence whereof you cite *Heb.*13.17. *Obey them that have the Rule over you, for they watch for your souls.* Brethren, what an injurious imputation is this? Do we not give you the title of *Rectores*

res Eccleſiarum? Doe we not in your inſtitution commit to you *regimen animarum?* Why will ye therefore bear your Readers in hand, that we herein rob you of your right? It is true, that here is a juſt diſtinction to be made, betwixt the government of ſoules, in ſeverall Congregations, and the government of the Church, conſiſting of many Congregations; that task is yours, this is the Biſhops, wherein their rule yet, is not Lordly, but brotherly, or paternall; your argument reacheth not home to this, and yet you ſtrain that place of 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12. beyond the due breadth, whiles you tenter it out to either a paritie, or communitie of cenſure.

Injoy now what you have ſo victorioufly purchaſed, but give me leave to ſumme up my reckonings alſo. Since then (how ever the name was at firſt promiſcuouſly uſed, yet) the Office of Biſhops, and Presbyters differed, even by Apoſtolike Inſtitution: and the Acts pertaining thereto, of Ordination, and power of ordinary government and cenſures, were in that very firſt age of the Church manifeſtly differenced; therefore Biſhops and Presbyters were not one.

SECT. VI.

THE practiſe of the Apoſtles is ſo farre from contradicting their rules, (which your brotherly charity would faſten upon my aſſertion) as that it is a moſt cleare proof, and illuſtration of it; Their practiſe is irrefragable in the charge, which they gave to *Timothy*, and *Titus*, as we ſhall prove in due place: Now if to this we ſhall adde the unqueſtionable gloſſe of the more cleare practiſe of their immediate ſucceſſors, I know not what more light can be deſired for the manifeſtation of this truth. Whereto ye boldly anſwer, *If this gloſs corrupt not the text, we ſhall admit it*; implying therein, too preſumptuouſly, that the univerſall practiſe of the whole Primitive Church ſucceeding the Apoſtles, may prove a Burdeaux-gloſſe to marre the Text.

Brethren goe you your owne way, let me erre with ſuch guides: But ye are diſpoſed to be liberall; ſomewhat ye will grant us, beſides that which we grant you. It is agreed, that

that the name of Biſhops and Presbyters were at firſt promiſcuouſly uſed; It is yeelded by you, *That in proceſs of time, ſome one was honoured with the name of Biſhop, and the reſt were called Presbyters.* But what, I beſeech you, was this *proceſs of time?* Here lies your either error, or fraud: We doe juſtly and confidently defend, that this time had no proceſſe at all; it was in the τῷ νῦν of the living Apoſtles, which we ſhall plainly make good in the ſequell. It is alſo yeelded, that this was not [*nomen inane*,] but ſeconded with ſome kind of imparity. What then is the difference? *All the queſtion*, you ſay, *is of divine right, and Apoſtolicall inſtitution of this imparity.* Let me beſeech the Reader to conſider ſeriouſly of the ſtate of this difference, in the miſtaking whereof I have, not a little, unjuſtly ſuffered; And to remember how I have expreſſed it in my Remonſtrance, fetching the pedegree of Epiſcopacy from Apoſtolicall (and therefore, in that right, Divine) inſtitution: And interpreting my ſelf not to underſtand by [*divine right*] any expreſſe Law of God requiring it, upon the abſolute neceſsity of the being of a Church, but an inſtitution of Apoſtles, inſpired

inſpired by the holy Ghoſt, warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had. Now whether it may be thus Apoſtolicall, or a meerly humane and Eccleſiaſticall invention, is the queſtion in hand.

On your part, you ſay, *ſtand Ierome, and Ambroſe.* Two ſtiffe champions indeed. And ſurely I muſt needs confeſſe, this is the onely countenance of your cauſe, which yet hath been blanked more then once. *Ierome tels us*, you ſay, *right down in Tit.* 1. *Idē eſt ergo Presbyter*, &c. Out of whoſe teſtimony you in ſumme collect, That *A Presbyter and a Biſhop were originally one*: That *the imparity was grounded upon Eccleſiaſticall cuſtome*: That *before this priority, the Church was governed by the common Councell of Presbyters*, and that *Biſhops ought ſtill ſo to govern*: And laſtly, that *The occaſion of this imparity, was the diviſion, which through the Devils inſtinct fell among Chriſtians.* You look now that I ſhould tell you that the Book is of uncertain credit, or that *Ierome* was a Presbyter, and not without ſome touch of envie to that higher dignity he miſſed; or that wiſer men then your ſelves have cenſured him in this point, for *Ærianiſme*: I plead none of theſe, but whiles

you

you expect that I ſhould anſwer to *Ierome*, I ſhall ſet *Ierome* to anſwer for himſelfe. For the firſt, I cannot but put you in mind, that the ſame Father citing the words of the Biſhop of Jeruſalem, That there is no difference betwixt a Biſhop and a Presbyter, paſſeth a *Satis imperitè* upon it: but let it be ſo.

At firſt, he ſayes, *Biſhops and Presbyters had but one title.* So ſay we too; But when began the diſtinction? Ye need not learne it of *Saravia*, he himſelfe tels you, *When diviſions began:* And when that? *When they began to ſay, I am Pauls, I am Apollo's, I am Cephas*; which was (I think) well and high in the Apoſtles time: But this you would cleanly put of, as ſpoken by *Ierome* in the Apoſtles phraſe, not of the time of the Apoſtle: This is but a generall intimation of contentions ariſen (though later) in the Church. Excuſe me Brethren, this ſhift will not ſerve your turne: Then, belike, there ſhould have been no diſtinct Biſhops till after-ages, upon this ground, that till then there were no diviſions: Or if ſo, why ſhould the remedie be ſo late after the diſeaſe? Or how comes he elſewhere to name Biſhops made by the Apoſtles, and to confeſſe that

before his time there had been many ſucceſſions? Beſides, he inſtanceth in the peculiar miſ-challenging of Baptiſme, which only S. *Paul* ſpecifieth in his owne time: And *Clemens* ſeconds him in his Epiſtle to the Corinthians, in taxing the continuance of thoſe diſtractions; ſo as by *Ieroms* own confeſsion, Epiſcopacy was ordained early within the Apoſtles times.

But then, ſay you, *It was not of Apoſtolicall intention, but of Diabolicall occaſion*: Weakly and abſurdly; As if the occaſion might not be deviliſh, and the inſtitution divine: As if the beſt Lawes did not riſe from the worſt manners. Were not the quarrels betwixt the Grecians and Hebrews for the maintenance of their widows, an evill occurrence? yet from the occaſion thereof was raiſed the Ordination of Deacons in the Church.

Yea but *Ierome* ſaith, *This was rather by the cuſtome of the Church, then by the truth of the Lords diſpoſition.* True, it was by the Cuſtome of the Church, but that Church was Apoſtolicall; not by the Lords diſpoſition immediately: for Chriſt gave no expreſſe rule for it, but mediately it was from Chriſt, as from his inſpi-

red

red Apoſtles. Let *Ierome* himſelfe interpret himſelfe, who tels us expreſly in his Epiſtle to *Euagrius*, this ſuperiority of Biſhops above Presbyters, is by Apoſtolicall tradition; which is as much as we affirme. And whiles he ſaith, (*toto orbe decretum eſt*) that in the time of thoſe firſt diviſions, it was decreed all the world over, that Biſhops ſhould be ſet up; I would faine know, by what power (beſides Apoſtolicall) ſuch a Decree could be ſo ſoon and ſo univerſally enacted. But *Ierome* ſaith, *The Presbyters governed the Church by their common Counſell*: So they did doubtleſſe altogether, till Epiſcopacy was ſetled; who dares deny it? Yea, but he ſaith, *They ought to doe ſtill*: So ſay we alſo, and ſo in ſome caſes we do: Church-government is Ariſtocraticall. Neither is any Biſhop ſo abſolute, as not to be ſubject to the judgement of a Synode: Yea in many matters it is determined by our Laws, that hee muſt take the adviſe and aſſiſtance of his Eccleſiaſticall Presbytery.

So then, S. *Ierome* is in his judgement no back friend of ours, but in his Hiſtory he is our Patron. With what forehead can they perſwade their Reader, the Originall of Epi-

ſcopacie was not in *Ieroms* opinion ſo early, when they cannot but confeſſe that the ſame Father hath, in flat termes, told us, that *Iames* was Biſhop of Jeruſalem, *Timothy* of Epheſus, *Titus* of Crete, that ever ſince the time of *Mark* the Euangeliſt, (who died five or ſixe yeares before *Peter* and *Paul*, and almoſt forty years before S. *Iohn*) at Alexandria, (till the dayes of *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*) the Presbyters have alwayes choſen one to be their Biſhop.

As for thoſe poore negative arguments which follow, palpably begging the queſtion, they are ſcarce worthie of a paſſe; were it not, that by them they goe about to confute their own Author, affirming, That upon occaſion of diviſions, Epiſcopacie was conſtituted: but he ſtands ſo cloſe to his owne grounds, as that (contrary to their miſ-allegation of D. *Whitakers*) he plainly tels them, Epiſcopacie is ſo proper a remedy for this evill, that unleſſe the Biſhop have a peerleſſe power, there will be as many Schiſmes as Prieſts, the wofull experience whereof we finde in the miſerable varieties of Separatiſme, at this day. Goe on, Brethren, ſince you

you are ſo reſolved, to ſtrike that friend, whom you bring in to ſpeak for you; teach your advocate S. *Ierome*, how unlikely it is, that the Apoſtles ſhould give way (as he profeſſes they did) to ſuch a remedie, as might prove both ineffectuall, and dangerous; and that their holineſſe ſhould make a ſtirrup for Antichriſt.

We lookt for *Ambroſe* to come in next; and, behold, you bring in a foiſted Commenter; a man by the convictions of *Whitakers*, *Spalatenſis*, *Cocus*, *Rivetus*, *Bellarmine*, *Poſſevine*, *Maldonate*, (as hath beene elſewhere ſhewed) of not a ſuſpected onely, but a crackt credit: If it mattered much, what he ſaid, I could out of his teſtimonie picke more advantage then you prejudice to my cauſe: But, if you will heare the true *Ambroſe* ſpeake; he tells you; There is one thing which God requireth of a Biſhop, another of a Presbyter, another of a Deacon; As for the perſons who brought in this imparitie, you tell us out of the ſame Authors, *The Presbyters themſelves brought it in? Witneſſe* Ierome *ad* Euagrium. *The Presbyters of* Alexandria *did call him their Biſhop, whom they had choſen from among themſelves, and placed in an*

Amb. de dignit. Sacerd. c. 3.

higher degree: But, brethren, what meanes this faithleſſe and halved citation? Had you ſaid all, the place would have anſwered for it ſelfe; the words are, *Nam & Alexandriæ à Marco Evangeliſta, &c.* For at *Alexandria* ever ſince *Mark* the Evangeliſt, untill the times of *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*, Biſhops, the Preſbyters have alwayes called one (choſen out of themſelves, and placed in an higher degree) Biſhop, as if an army ſhould chuſe their Generall. Why did you avoid the name of [*Mark* the Evangeliſt] but that your hearts told you, that he dying many yeares within the time of the Apoſtles, this election, and appellation, and diſtinction of degrees of Biſhops and Presbyters, muſt needs have been in the life time of the Apoſtles; and not without their knowledge and approbation? The Preſbyters then choſe their Biſhops: who doubts it? But upon whoſe order, and Inſtitution ſave that which S. *Paul* to the Superintendents met at *Miletus*, Acts 20. *Spiritus ſanctus vos conſtituit Epiſcopos?* I marvell Brethren, with what face you can make *Ierome* ſay, that the Presbyters

Nam & Alexandriæ à Marco Evangeliſta uſq; ad Heraclam & Dionyſium Epiſcopos, Presbyteri ſemper unum ex ſe electũ, in excelſiori gradu collocatum, Epiſcopum nominabant, quomodo ſi exercitus Imperatorem faciat, &c.

The holy Ghoſt made you Biſhops, or Over-ſeers.

Presbyters themſelves were the Authors of this imparity, when as himſelf hath plainly aſcribed this to Gods own work; when reading that, *Eſay* 60.17. *I will make thy Officers peace,* (according to the *Septuagint*) δώσω τὰς ἀρχοντάς σου, &c. *I will give thy Princes in peace, and thy Biſhops in righteouſneſſe,* he applies this to the Governours of the Evangelicall Church: and the bleſſed Martyr and Biſhop *S. Cyprian*, to the ſame purpoſe; The Deacons (ſaith he) muſt remember that the Lord himſelfe choſe Apoſtles, that is, Biſhops, but Deacons were choſen by the Apoſtles themſelves.

And when ye cannot but know, that the Apoſtles themſelves were the immediate actors in this buſineſſe; if at leaſt ye will beleeve the Hiſtories, and Fathers of the Church; *Irenæus* tels you plainly, that the Apoſtles *Peter* and *Paul*, delivered the Epiſcopacy of that Church to *Linus*: and, that *Polycarpus* was by the Apoſtles made Biſhop, in *Aſia*, of the Church of *Smyrna*: and *Tertullian* particularly, that *Polycarpus* was there placed by S. *Iohn*.

And S. *Chryſoſtome* clearly ſayes, that *Ignatius* was

τὸν ἐνλεγόμενα ἐκείνοις, καὶ πανταχοῦ συγγενόμενον.

was not onely trained up with the Apoſtles, but that he received his Biſhoprick from them; and emphatically, that the hands of the bleſſed Apoſtles touched his holy head.

ὡς φησὶ τὸν ἐμὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀρχὴν ταύτην ἐνεχειρίσθη καὶ ἡ τῶν μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χεῖρες τὸ ἱερὸν ἐκείνης ἥψαντο κεφαλῆς. *Chryſoſt. Tom. 5. Edition. Savil. p. 499.*

And laſtly, the true *Ambroſe*, (to the ſhameing of that Counterfeit, whom you bring forth under that name) tels you, that *Paul* ſaw *Iames* at *Ieruſalem*, becauſe he was made Biſhop of that place, by the Apoſtles: your ſlip may talk of a Councell, wherein this was done: but this is as falſe, as himſelfe: It is well known there never was any ſuch Councell in the Chriſtian world: ſince, the firſt generall Synod was the *Nicene*. And *Ieroms* [*toto orbe Decretum*] as we have ſhewed, could import no other, then an Apoſtolicall act: As for S. *Auguſtine*, Is it not a juſt wonder, Reader, that theſe men dare cite him for their opinion, (upon occaſion of a modeſt word concerning the honourable title of Epiſcopacy) when as they cannot but know, and grant, that he hath blazoned *Ærius* for an heretick, meerly for holding the ſame Tenet which they defend?

Aug. Ep. 19.

Laſtly, if *Gregory Nazianzen* in a pathetick manner

manner have wiſhed the abolition of Epiſcopacie,(as he never did) what more diſlike had he ſhown to it, then he did to Synods, when he ſaid (μηδεμίας συνόδου ἕξοδον, &c.) that he never knew good come of them? But reader, it will be worth the while, to inquire into the fidelity of theſe mens allegations; Doe but conſult the place of *Nazianzen*, & thou ſhalt find that he ſpeaks not particularly of Epiſcopacie, but of all πρωτεῖα, or precedencie, and of all quarrelſome challenges of place, & all tyrannicall carriage of one man towards another, wiſhing that there were no ſtanding upon points of precedency, but every man might be reſpected according to his vertue: and adding at laſt (*Nunc autem dextrum hoc, et ſiniſtrum, et medium latus*, &c.) But now (ſaith he) the right hand, and the left, and the middle place, and the higher and lower degree, and going before, and going cheeke by jole, what a world of troubles have they brought upon us? Thus he. See then, Reader, what a teſtimony, here is for the utter abolition of Epiſcopacy, from a man who was ſo intereſſed in the calling, that he was wont to be ſtyled by his adverſaries Τριεπίσκοπος, The Biſhop of three

Greg. Naz. Orat. 28. ἄριστον γὲ, &c. μηδὲ, &c.

Sees: By this judge, reader, of the reſt. So then, after all the clamours, and colourable pretences of theſe men, this imparity and juriſdiction was conveyed from the Apoſtles hands, and deduced in an uninterrupted Line, through all following ages to this preſent day.

How can this be (ſay they) *unleſſe our Biſhops will draw the Line of their pedegree, through the lines of Antichriſt, and joyne iſſue, and mingle blood with Rome?* For ſhame, Brethren, eate this word; What? are there no Biſhops but at Rome? Is the whole Church all the world over Antichriſtian, even thoſe, which are no leſſe angry at Rome then your ſelves? Hath not Epiſcopall imparitie continued in them, all this while? Is there no diſtinction to be had betwixt the calling, and the abuſe? If the Antichriſtian Church have had Biſhops; ſo it hath had Churches, Scriptures, Baptiſme, Learning, Creeds; Becauſe we have all theſe with them, will ye ſay we deduce them from the loines of Antichriſt? Away with this impotent ſpight, and uncharitableneſſe; and learne to be more modeſt & true in your aſſertions, and leſſe confident in your appeals.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

LEt me balk your idle words; the queſtion is of the difference betwixt our preſent Biſhops, and the ancient, this you will ſpread forth in three particulars; The firſt is the manner of Election, to theſe places of eminence; *which was, of old, ordered, by the privity, conſent, and approbation of the people*, which you eagerly ſeeke to prove out of *Cyprian*: neither can it be denied that he is full, and punctuall in this point: Holy *Athanaſius* ſeconds it; And the old rule was: *Electio clericorum, conſenſus Principis, petitio plebis*; that a Biſhop came in by the ſuite of the people, the Election of the Clergy, the conſent of the Prince. Ye might well have in this caſe ſpared the fetching in of the good Emperour *Conſtantine*: doubtleſſe this was the manner of old; what variations followed afterward in theſe proceedings, our learned Dr. *Field* hath well ſhowed; but ſure, this intereſt of the people continued ſo long, even in the Roman Church, that *Platina* can tell us, *Gregory* the ſeventh was elected by Cardinalls, *Platina in vita Greg. 7.*

Clerks, Acoluthites, Subdeacons, Prieſts, Abbots, Biſhops, Clergie, and Laitie: The inconveniences that were found in thoſe tumultuarie elections, and the ſeditious iſſue of them (which *Nazianzen* and *Euſebius* have laid before us in ſome particulars) were, I ſuppoſe, the cauſe why they were (in a ſort) laid downe; But an imitation of this practiſe, we have ſtill continuing in our Church, wherein upon the vacancy of every See, there is a *Conge-d'eſlire* (that is, a leave to elect) ſent down from the King, to the Preſbyters (*viz.* the Deane and Chapter of that Church) for an enſuing election of their Biſhop; and, if this were yet more free, we ſhould not like it the leſſe: But, in the meane time, Brethren, how are you quite beſide the Cuſhion? Where the objection was, *That the Apoſtles Biſhops, and ours were two, in reſpect of managing their function*; And my defence is, that our Biſhops challenge not any other Spirituall power, then the Apoſtles delegated to *Timothy* and *Titus*, you now tell us, *of the different manner of our Elections*; What is this *ad Rhombum*? we ſpeake of their actions, and exerciſe of power, you talke of others actions

to

to them; Were it ſo pleaſing to his Majeſty and the State, to decree it, we ſhould be well content to ſubmit to this ancient forme of Election; the forbearance whereof, is neither our fault, nor our prejudice: ſo as you might well have beſtowed this breath to a better purpoſe, and rather conclude, that notwithſtanding this forme of different choice, our Biſhops and thoſe of former times are not two.

SECT. VIII.

WEE follow you into the execution of our Epiſcopall Office, wherein you will ſhow ours, and the Apoſtles to be two; ſo clearely, that he who will not wilfully ſhut his eyes, may ſee a latitude of differences, and that in three points: The firſt, in ſole juriſdiction, which you ſay, *was a ſtranger, yea a monſter to former times*, and will make it good by the power of (that, which in all wiſe writers was wont to be contra-diſtinguiſhed) Ordination.

For this maine point, let my Anſwerers

know, that the Ordination is the Biſhops, but the *ſole* (in their ſenſe) is their own: neither did our Biſhops ever challenge it, as theirs alone, without the Presbyters, but as principally theirs, with them: ſo, as if the power be in the Biſhop, the aſsiſtance is from them, the practiſe in both: ſo is it in the Biſhops, that ordinarily and regularly it may not be done without them, and yet ordinately, it may not be done without them by the Biſhop: which hath bin ſo conſtantly, and carefully ever obſerved, that I challenge them to ſhew any one inſtance in the Church of England to the contrary; Say Brethren, I beſeech you, after all this noyſe, what Biſhop ever took upon him to ordain a Presbyter alone, or without the concurrent impoſition of many hands? They, no leſſe then *Cyprian*, can ſay, *Ego & collegæ*; Although I muſt tell you this was in the caſe of *Aurelius*, made a Lector; And in that other teſtimony, which you cite out of his Epiſtle 58. he ſpeaks onely of the fraternities conſent, and approbation, not of their concurrence in their act; this is ſmall game with you.

Cypr. Ep. 33.

Neither is it leſſe the order of the Church of England

England then of the Councell of Carthage, *Cum ordinatur Presbyter*, &c. When a Presbyter is ordained, the Biſhop bleſsing him, and holding his hand upon his head, all the Preſbyters that are preſent, ſhall likewiſe lay their hands upon his head, with the hands of the Biſhop: With what conſcience can ye alledge this, as to choak us in our contrary practiſe; when you know this is perpetually, and unfailably done by us? But now, that the Readers may ſee how you ſhuffle, ſhew us but one inſtance of a Presbyters regular and practiſed ordaining without a Biſhop, and carry the cauſe; elſe you do but abuſe the Reader with an oſtentation of proving what was never denied.

But here, by the way, brethren, you muſt give me leave to pull you by the ſleeve, and to tell you of two or three foul ſcapes, which will trie whether you can bluſh. Firſt, that you abuſe *Firmilianus* in caſting upon him an opinion of Presbyters ordaining, which he never held; He, in his Epiſtle to *Stephen* Biſhop of Rome, ſpeaking of the true Church in oppoſition to hereſies, deſcribes it thus, (*Vbi præſident majores natu, qui & baptizandi, &* *Firmil Cyp in. Epiſt. 75.*

manum

manum imponendi, et ordinandi poſsident poteſtatem: under this name expreſsing thoſe Biſhops; who preſiding in the Church, poſſeſſe the power of Baptizing, Confirming, Ordaining; you injuriouſly Wire-draw him to Preſbyters, and foiſt in [*Seniores et Præpoſitos*] which are farre from the clauſe and matter. Be convinced with the more cleare words of the ſame Epiſtle, *Apoſtolis, et Epiſcopis, qui illis vicariâ Ordinatione ſucceſſerunt*.

Secondly, that you bewray groſſe ignorance in tranſlating *Ambroſes* [*Presbyteri conſignant*] by *Preſbyters ordaining*; Who, that ever knew what belonged to antiquity, would have beene guilty of ſuch a ſoleciſme: when every novice knowes, that, *conſigning*, ſignifies *confirmation*, and not *ordaining*?

Thirdly, you diſcover not too much skill in not diſtinguiſhing of the *Chorepiſcopi*: ſome whereof had both the nature and power of Epiſcopacy to all purpoſes, and therefore might well by the Biſhops licence in his owne charge impoſe hands, others not; And leſſe fidelity, in citing the Councell of *Antioch*, *can.* 10. and the 13. of the Councell of *Ancyra*, if it were not out of our way, to fetch them into tryall. Laſtly,

Laſtly, I cannot but tell you that you have meerly caſt away all this labour, and fought with your owne ſhadow; for, how ever it were not hard to prove, that in the firſt times of the Church it was appropriated to the Biſhop, to Ordaine, (which you cannot but cõfeſſe out of *Ierome*, and *Chryſoſtom*) yet, ſince we ſpeaking of our owne time and Church, doe both profeſſe and practiſe an aſſociation of Presbyters with us, in the act of Ordination, whom have you all this while oppoſed? It is enough that you have ſeemed to ſay ſomthing, and have ſhowne ſome little reading, to no purpoſe.

SECT. IX.

YEt ſtill, you will needs beat the ayre very furiouſly, and fight pitifully with your ſelves; Alas, brethren, why will ye take ſo much paines to goe wilfully out of your way, and to miſ-lead the reader with you? Who ever challenged (in that ſenſe which you faine to your ſelves) a ſole Juriſdiction? Why will you with ſome ſhow of learning

confute that, which you yeeld us to confesse? we confesse this [*sole*] cryed downe by store of Antiquity; we doe willingly grant that Presbyters have, and ought to have, and exercise a jurisdiction within their owne charge, *in foro conscientiæ*; we grant that in all the great affayres of the Church, the Presbyters, whether in Synodes, or otherwise, ought to be consulted with; we grant that the Bishops had of old their Ecclesiasticall Councell of Presbyters, with whose advise they were wont to manage the greatest matters, and we still have so; for to that purpose serve the Deanes and Chapters; and the Lawes of our Church frequently make that use of them; we grant, that Presbyters have their votes in provinciall Synods: But we justly say that the superiority of jurisdiction is so in the Bishop, as that Presbyters neither did, nor may exercise it without him; and that the exercise of externall jurisdiction is derived, from, by, under him to those which execute it within his Dioces. Thus, it is to *Timothy* that S. *Paul* gives the charge concerning the rebuke of an Elder, or not receiving an accusation against him; It is to *Titus* that S. *Paul* leaves

To this purpose is that which you cite out of *Clemens Alex. Strom. l. 5.*

Alluded to in that usuall allegation of *Ambtose.*

leaves the (ἐπιδιόρθωσιν) correction of his Cretians; Thus, the Canons of the Apostles; Ἄνευ γνώμης, &c. Thus the blessed Martyr *Ignatius* in his undoubted Epistle to those of *Smyrna*, Μηδεὶς χωρὶς, &c. Let no man doe any thing, in matters belonging to the Church, without the Bishop. Thus the Councell of *Antioch* orders, that whatsoever belongs to the Church, is to be governed, managed, and disposed, by the judgement and authority of the Bishop, who hath τῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων ἐξουσίαν, the power of those things which belong to the Church.

Μηδεὶς χωρὶς ὑπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

Concil. Antioch. c. 24, 25.

It were easie to surfet the readers eyes, with the cleare testimonies of Fathers, and Councells, to this purpose. Our learned Bishop *Downam* hath given a world of instances of the severall acts of jurisdiction, appropriated to Bishops by antiquity, exercised upon both Laicks, and Clergy: to him I remit my reader; So as, you may easily set antiquity together by the eares, in this point, if you please; but surely, the advantage will be so farre on our side, that if you have not ten for one against you, I will yeeld my cause.

B. Down. def. l. 3. ch. 5.

There is great difference of times, and in them of fashions: In those persecuted times, when the Church was backed with no Christian Magistrate, it was no boot to bid the guides of the Church to combine their Councels, and to give strength to their mutuall actions: when a generall peace once blessed them, and they had the concurrence both of soveraigne and subordinate authority with them, they began so much to remit of this care of conjoyning their forces, as they supposed to find lesse need of it. From hence grew a devolution of all lesse weighty affairs to the weilding of single hands. For my part, I perswade my selfe, that the more frequent communicating of all the important businesse of the Church, whether censures or determinations, with those grave assistents, which in the eye of the Law are designed to this purpose, were a thing not onely unprejudiciall to the honour of our function, but very behovefull to the happy administration of the Church.

In the mean while, see brethren, how you have with *Simon* fished all night, and caught nothing. My word was, that ours were the same

ſame with the Apoſtles Biſhops, in this, that they challenge no other ſpirituall power then was by Apoſtolique authority delegated to *Timothy* and *Titus*: You run out upon the following times of the Church, and have with ſome waſt quotations laboured to prove, that *In after ages, Biſhops called in Presbyters to the aſſiſtance of their juriſdiction*; which is as much to me, as *Baculus ſtat in angulo.*

SECT. X.

YOur next Section runs yet wilder: I ſpeak of the no-difference of our Biſhops from the firſt, in the challenge of any ſpirituall power to themſelves, other then delegated to *Timothy* and *Titus*; You tell mee of delegating their power to others. What is this to the nature of the calling? Doth any man claime this as eſſentiall to his Epiſcopacie? Doth any man ſtand upon it, as a piece of his ſpirituall power? If this be granted to be an accidentall error of ſome particular man, (for it cannot be faſtned upon all) what difference doth it make in the ſubſtance of

the function? As if ſome monſter ſuddenly preſented it ſelfe to you, you aske, *Was ever ſuch a thing heard of in the beſt primitive times? that men which never received impoſition of hands, ſhould not only be received into aſſiſtance, but be wholly intruſted with the power of ſpirituall juriſdiction?* Let me ask you again, Was ever ſuch a thing heard of, either in the Primitive, or following times, that Lay-men ſhould be ſo far admitted to the managing of ſpirituall juriſdiction, as to lay their hands upon their Miniſters in their Ordination? Yet this is both done and challenged by too many of your good friends. Why do you object that to us, wherewith the Presbyterian part may be more juſtly choaked? But herein, Brethren, you do foulely over-reach, in that you charge our Biſhops, as in a generality, with wholly-intruſting the power of ſpirituall juriſdiction to their Chancellors, and Commiſſaries: The aſsiſtance of thoſe which are learned in the Law, wee gladly uſe, neither can well want in the neceſſary occaſions of our judicature; but that wee doe either wilfully or negligently deveſt our ſelves abſolutely of that power, and wholly put it in-

Howſoever it is now in ſome Reformed Churches laid down.

to

to Laick hands, it is a meere ſclander.

For want of better proofs of the illegality of this courſe, you bring a negative authority from *Cyprian*, telling us, what that holy Martyr did not, *That he did not ſend Complainants to his Chancellour or Commiſſarie*: It is very like he did not; nor yet to the Bench of a Lay Preſbyterie: But if he did not commit the hearing of his Cauſes to a Lay-man, we find that ſome others did: *Socrates* can tell you of *Silvanus* the good Biſhop of Troas, καλέσαι τὸς κληρικὸς, &c. perceiving that ſome of his Clergie did corruptly make gaine of Cauſes, would no more appoint any of his Clergie (δικάσαι τῶν κλήρου) to be a Judge, but made choiſe of ſome faithfull man of the Laity to whom he committed that audience, and was much honoured for it. *Socrat. l. 7. c. 37.*

What Biſhop *Downam* yeelds concerning the Ordinaries, Vicars, and Chancellors of former times, (till *Ambroſe's* daies) that they were onely Clergie-men, your reject with ſcorne, and challenge any man *to produce the names of any Clergie-man that was Vicar to Ambroſe, or Chancellour to Auguſtine, &c.* What a poore brave is this? I challenge you to produce

duce the name of any Secretary, or Actuary that *Ambroſe*, or *Auſtin* had: becauſe you cannot, ſhall I conclude they had none ſuch? That inſtance of *Sylvanus*, not long after *Ambroſe*, is evidence enough: But the antiquity of Chancellors, which were the ſame with *Eccleſiecdici*, or *Epiſcoporum ecdici*, is proveable enough, (if it were for this place) and their neceſſary uſe, beyond the power of your confutation; But I had rather refer my reader to S. *Thomas Ridley*, and others that have laboured in that argument; and appeale to all mens judgement how ſoundly you have (upon this ground) proved that our Biſhops and the former were two.

SECT. XI.

2 King. 5.7. HOw juſtly may I ſay, Readers, of theſe men as the King of *Iſrael* ſaid of the King of *Syria*: *See I beſeech you, how they ſeeke a quarrell againſt me*? My juſt defence was, that our Biſhops are the ſame in ſubſtance, and effect, with thoſe which were ordained by the Apoſtles: they come now, and tell me, of an

an oath *ex officio*, used in the high Commission, and in our Consistories; as if every particular manner of Proceeding in our Courts, and judicatures must either be patterned by the Apostolike, or els they are utterly unjustifiable; why do they not as wel chalenge us, that we give men the book to touch, and kisse, in taking an oath? Why doe they not aske, how wee can prove that those Apostolicall Bishops had Notaries, Registers, Advocates, Consistories? what frivolous and delusory exceptions are these to all wise men; and how strangely savouring of a weak judgement, and strong malice? As for your cavil at the oth *ex officio*, since you wil needs draw it in by head and shoulders; how little soever it concernes us, I returne you this answer. That, if any of our profession have in the pressing of it exceeded the lawfull bounds, I excuse him not, I defend him not; let him bear away his own load; but *in thesi*, surely there is more to bee said for it, then you wil seem to take notice of. You ask *for any precedent of it, in good antiquity*: I give a precedent as ancient as *Moses*, Exod. 22. 10, 11. and that other oath and reall imprecation,

in the cauſe of jelouſie, *Num.* 5. 19. But perhaps it wil fit you better, that I inſtance in M. *Calvins* caſe, who together with the Conſiſtory of Elders, appointed the ſaid oath to be given to *Camperell* a Miniſter of Geneva, and to the other parties accuſed of an offenſive dancing in the houſe of widow *Balthaſar*, in which corporal oath three interrogatories being put to the deponents, two of them are ſaid to be concerning their purpoſes and intentions. If yet you cal for other precedents, I cal your eys home, and wil you to look into our Courts of Kings Bench, Common Pleas, Exchequer, Star-chamber, wherein the defendant is ordinarily put to anſwer the bill, and interrogatories, upon oath. As for that old Maxime of *Nemo tenetur prodere ſeipſum*, you may (if it pleaſe you) object it as well to *Moſes*, to *Calvin*, to our Courts; it is eaſily thus ſatiſfied, that no man is bound at the ſuit of a party, ſo to anſwer criminous Articles, or ſuch as are *Propinqui actus*, (as Lawyers interpret it;) But as *Petrus de Ferrariis* well determins it, *Proditus per famam; tenetur ſeipſum oſtendere, & purgare*; when a fame accuſes him he may clear himſelfe by

Calvin E. piſt f 421.

an

an oath, it is to be presupposed, that a man is brought into question by some of those Lawfull meanes, which open a way to a further inquiry; and then (as *Aquinas* well) if there be a *Semi-plena probatio*, or a strong fame, or evident tokens, an oath is seasonably imposed: But sure, the intention of the oath is quite mistaken, for it is meant to acquit and justifie, not to accuse; neither is any man pressed to answer further, then he is bound in law: neither are the Compulsions simple and absolute, but onely Causative, as the learned Apologist hath fully declared. If then a *Diocletian* or *Maximilian* (as you cal him) shall enact, that the adverse party shall not be required to exhibite such evidences as should create troubles to themselves, it is no other then is every where practised in all Courts of Iudicature, and may well stand with the oath *ex officio*, as it is formerly limited. Be advised therfore (til you understand the case better) to forbear to talke of the Lamp of nature, in the night of Eth nicisme but know, that the light of the law of God, and rigt reason & common practise, give sufficient alowance to that which your misprision

Aquin.

sion cavills at, in those, whom ye ought to acknowledge the Fathers of the Church. You tell us *of the custome of the Church, & proceedings in the time of* Athanasius, *and the rule of* Gratian; as if we disallowed those just courses, where there is a direct & manifest accusation and evident proofes to bee had; but what doth this hinder, that in case of a justly grounded suspition, and a complaint of a halfe-proved offence, a man should manifest his innocence by oath? That ye might seem to have seene the Canon-law, you tell us *that in some cases, it allowes tryall without witnesses, namely, where the crime may be justly called notarious* & then deeply expound *notorium*, by *manifestum*, therein plainly contradicting your selves; for, if that be manifest which is lawfully known, by confession, or by probation, or by the evidence of the thing; what probation can there be, (besides confession and evidence) without witnesses? But this errour is as trifling, as your accusation; and after all this waste of words, notwithstanding some personall abuses of Officers in undue proceeses of their Courts, our Bishops and the former are not two.

SECT.

SECT. 12.

YOur next Section hath more pompe of reading in it, then the reſt, but to as little purpoſe, I ſhall trouble you with neglecting it; we cannot anger a gay man more then in paſſing by him unſeene; my ground was, that our Biſhops differ not in reſpect of any ſpirituall power, from that, which was delegated from Apoſtolike authority, to *Timothy* & *Titus*; you ſpend your time, in proving that *they differ in their imployment, in ſecular and ſtate affaires*; but, I aske, is this difference, or fault univerſall, or not; ſure, you cannot ſay they are all thus miſimployed; and if not, why is this blame caſt upon all? why ſhould the calling, & others innocence ſuffer? My cauſe ſhall yeeld you your poſtulate herein, and be no whit the worſe, it is true the ordinary managing of ſecular affaires, is not proper for a Biſhop: *Chryſoſtoms* counſell, *Julians* practiſe, *Conſtatines* bounty, *Cyrills* inſolent pompe, the Romane Biſhops degenerating, into a ſecular principality,

Cyprians grave limitation, the juſt inhibitions of many Canons, are of an undoubted truth; and we could eaſily (if need were) ad many more to theſe, and tell you of thoſe ἀναγκαῖα ψεύδη that muſt upon the Apoſtolike Canons be avoyded by ſacred perſons, and the rigorous charge of *Cyprian*, againſt *Geminius* victor, for ordaining *Geminus Fauſtinus*, a Presbyter, but the Executor of his laſt will; with many other the like inſtances; but what are theſe to the work in hand? Two exceptions muſt neceſſarily bee admitted; the one of extraordinary ocficaons, and ſervices, as, when a Prince, or ſtate, having had good proofe of the abilities of an Eccleſiaſticall perſon, ſhall thinke fit, (as now it is done in this great Northerne negotiation) to call for his Counſaile, or to employ his preſent agency, for a time, in ſome main buſineſſe that may import the publike good, and ſafety of the Church, or Commonwealth, ſo St *Chryſoſtome* once, ſo St. *Ambroſe* twice, was imployed in Embaſſie, from the Emperours: The very trade of Tent-making did as much take up St. *Paul* for the time, as a ſtate-imployment might have done, and

Pro dominove victoris non fiat blatio, aut depre, catioaliqua- nomine ejus in Eccleſia frequentetur. Cypr. *Rogatiano fratri l. 3. Ep. 9.*

and how many have we knowne, that have (not unprofitably) profeſſed Phyſicke both for ſoule and body, and done much good in both? The other, of a charitable interpoſition in matters of difference for peace and reconciliation; and compoſing of the unkinde quarrels of diſſenting neighbours, wherewith St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Auſtine* were ſo extreamly taken up, that the latter makes no little complaint of the importunity of thoſe continuall interpellations; ſuch, as both his morning ſtudies were diſtracted by them, and the afternoon wholly ſpent in them: and profeſſeth, he could not have the opportunity of opening his eſtate, and heart to Biſhop *Ambroſe*, by reaſon of that continuall audience of cauſes, daily brought before that great Prelate: ſurely, if the charity of more of ours have not rendered them more guilty of ſecularity, in this kind, than the ſuppoſed ambition of others, there will be no cauſe why our Biſhops, and the Biſhops of former times ſhould be two.

Aug. Ep. 110.

SECT.

SECT. 13.

IT is true *the Remonstrant soares above these after-times, even as high as the Apostles*: As if you knew not this before; when as all this while, you have indeavoured to shew that the Apostles Bishops, and ours are two. We do again professe, that if our Bishops challenge any other power, then was delegated to, and required of *Timothy* and *Titus*; wee shall yeeld them usurpers: you kindely tell us, *so we deserve to be, if we doe but challenge the same power*; and why so, I beseech you brethren? because *Timothy* and *Titus* (yee say) *were Evangelists, and so moved in an higher sphere*; Liberally and boldly spoken; but where is your proofe? For *Timothy*, ye say the Text is cleare: but what Text, what the least intimation have you for *Titus*? surely not so much as the least ground of a conjecture; yet how confidently you avow for both: and even for *Timothy* your glosse is clear, not your text: St. *Paul* bids him do the worke of an Euangelist, what then, that rather intimates

timates that he was none: for he doth not ſay, do thine own worke: but the worke of an Evangeliſt: when I tell my friend, that I muſt deſire him to do the office of a Soliciter, or a Secretary for me; I do herein intimate, that he is neither; but ſo for the time employed; why is it not ſo here? And what I beſeech you is the worke of an Evangeliſt, but to preach the Evangell, or good tydings of peace? So, as St. *Paul* herein gives no other charge to his *Timothy*, then in 2. *Tim.* 4. 2. *Preach the Word, be inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon:* And this you ſay and urge, to be the worke of a Biſhop too; well, therefore may *Timothy*, notwithſtanding this charge, be no other then a Biſhop: what need theſe words to be contradiſtinguiſhed? St. *Paul* ſayes of himſelfe, *Whereto I am appoynted a Preacher, and an Apoſtle, and a teacher of the Gentiles*; what ſhall we ſay St. *Paul* was an Apoſtle, he was not a Preacher, or not a Doctor, but an Apoſtle? You diſtinguiſh of *Evangeliſts*; *the word is taken either for the writers of the Goſpell, or for the teachers of it*, and why then was not St. *Paul* an Evangeliſt, who profeſſed to be a teacher of the Goſpell unto the Gentiles, 2. Timi. 11.

Theſe teaching Evangeliſts, you dreame to be of two ſorts; *the one, thoſe that had ordinary places and gifts; the other extraordinary*: but tell me ſirs, for my learning; where do you finde thoſe ordinary-placed, and ordinary-gifted Evangeliſts? unleſſe you mean to comprſe all Preachers under this name? and then a Biſhop may be an Evangeliſt alſo, ſo, as the difference of a Biſhop and an Evangeliſt vaniſheth. The truth is, theſe ordinary Evangeliſts are a new fiction; their true imployment was to be ſent by the Apoſtles, from place to place, for the preaching of the Goſpell, without a ſetled reſidence upon any one charge: upon this advantage, you raiſe a ſlight argument, *that St. Paul beſought Timothy to abide at Epheſus.* 1. Tim. 1. 3. *which had been a needleſſe importunity if he had the Epiſcopall charge of Epheſus; for then he muſt have neceſſarily reſided there*: whereas you recite ſeverall proofes and occaſions of his abſence, which will appear to be of little force, if a man doe duly conſider the ſtate of thoſe times: the neceſſity wherof in that firſt plantation of the Goſpell, made even the moſt fixed Sars planetary, calling them, frequent-

ly

ly, from the places of their abode, to thoſe ſervices which were of moſt uſe for the ſucceſſe of that great worke: yet ſo, as that either after their errands fully-done, or upon all opportune intermiſſions, they returned to their own Chaire: The ſtory therefore of thoſe journal computations might well have been ſpared.

Your argument from *Pauls* calling the Elders of *Epheſus* to *Miletus*, how ever you *lean* upon it, it will prove but a Reed.

Your ſelves confeſſe (I know not upon what certaine ground) *that Timothy was at the* meeting, *Acts* 20. with St. *Paul*: *Had he been Biſhop there, the Apoſtle* (you ſay) *inſtead of giving the Elders a charge to feede the flocke of Chriſt, would have given that charge to* Timothy, *and not to them: Beſides, the Apoſtle would not have ſo forgotten himſelfe, as to call the Elders Biſhops, before the Biſhops face; and would have given them ſome directions, how to carry themſelves to their Biſhops*: In all which, brethren, you goe upon wrong ground; wil ye grant that theſe aſſembled perſons were Presbyters, and not Biſhops? under ſome Biſhop, though not under *Timothy*? otherwiſe, why doe you argue

from the want of directions to them, as inferiours? but if they were indeed Bishops, and not mere Presbyters, (as the word it selfe imports) your argument is lost: For then the charge is equally given to *Timothy*, and all the rest; and it was no forgetfulnesse to call them as they were, you are straight ready to reply, *how unpossible it is* (according to us) *there should be many Bishops in one City; and here were many Presbyters from Ephesus*: but let me mind you, that though these Presbyters were sent for from *Ephesus*, yet they were not said to be all of *Ephesus*: Thither they were called to meet St. *Paul* in all likelihood, from divers parts, which he seemes to imply, when he saith; *Ye all amongst whom I have gone preaching the Kingdome of God*; intimating the super-intendents of severall places; so as, notwithstanding these urged probabilities, *Timothy* might have beene, both before this time and at that present Bishop of *Ephesus*; after which, if *Paul* tooke him along with him to *Hierusalem*, this is no derogation to his Episcopacy: And if *Timothy* were yet, after this, prisoner with St. *Paul* at *Rome*, (as you argue from *Hebr.* 13. 23.) this is no derogation

rogation from his *Episcopacy* at *Epheſus*; but to cut the ſinewes of all this ſtrong proofe of your computation; it is more than probable, that, whereas the whole hiſtory of the *Acts* ends with *Pauls* firſt beeing at *Rome*, that Apoſtle ſurvived divers years, and paſſed many travells, and did many great matters, for the plantation, and ſetling of churches, whereof we can looke for no account from Scripture, ſave by ſome glances in his following Epiſtles; into which time theſe occurrents concerning *Timothy* and *Titus*, his ordination did fall, as may be juſtly proved out of the Chronologicall table of the experienced *Jacob Cappellus*, compared with *Baronius*: Now then, the Reader may take his choyſe, whether he will believe all antiquity, (that have medled with this ſubject) affirming *Timothy* to have been biſhop of *Epheſus*, or whether he wil believe a new hatched contradiction of yeſterday, raiſed out of imaginary probabilities; Shortly, it is far enough from appearing, that *Timothy* was no *Biſhop*, but a Miniſter, an Evangeliſt a fellow-labourer of the Apoſtles, an Apoſtle, a Meſſenger of the Church; it rather appeares that he was al theſe in divers ſences, and up-

on ſeverall occaſions.

The like yea ſay of *Titus*, whom you are pleaſed to create an *Evangeliſt*, not being able to ſhew, that ever God made him ſo; ſave in that generall ſence that might well ſtand with Epiſcopacy; you tel us a ſtory of his perigrination in the attendance of *Paul*, wherein you ſhall not expect any contradiction; but you ſhall give me leave to take you tripping in your own Tale: *from Cilicia*, you ſay, *Paul paſſed to Creet, where he left Titus for a while to ſet in order things that remain*: this (*for a while*) you put into a different Character, as if it were part of the Text; and guiltily tranſlate (τα λειπομενα) things that remaine, whereas ours turne it (in a more full expreſſion of an *Epiſcopall* power) *things that are wanting*, or *left undone*; but this is not the matter, you do yet again repeat the (*for a while*) urging the ſhort time that *Titus* could bee left at *Creet*, and yet, in your own marginall computation there is no leſſe diſtance of time, betwixt this placing in *Creet*, and ſending for him to his next remove, unto *Nicopolis*, thā betwixt the year 46 & 51. the ſpace of five years, which was a large gap of time,

in

in that unſetled condition, and manifold diſtractive occaſions of the Church; If afterwards hee were by Apoſtolicall command called away to tend the more concerning ſervices of the Church; this could no whit have impeacht the truth of his Epiſcopacy; but the truth is, he was ordained by St. *Paul* after all thoſe journeys mentioned in the *Acts*, (and as *Baronius* with great conſent of Antiquity computes it) a year after *Timothy*; ſo, as you may well put up your concluſion, as rather begged than inforced, and caſt it upon the Readers courteſie to beleeve you againſt al *antiquity*, that *Titus* was an *Evangeliſt* and no *Biſhop*; where as theſe two may well agree together, he was an Evangeliſt when he travelled abroad; he was a biſhop afterwards, when hee ſtayed and ſetled at home.

You object to your ſelfe *the authority of ſome Fathers, that have called* Timothy *and* Titus *Biſhops*: Some name, if you can, that Father that hath called them otherwiſe: away with theſe envious diminutions, when yea have a cloud of witneſſes of much antiquity, which averre *Timothy* and *Titus* to have both

both lived, and dyed *Bishops*, the one of *Ephesus*, of *Creet* the other: *yea but so some Fathers have called them Arch-bishops and Patriarchs too*: What of that? therein they have then acknowledged them bishops, paramount; and if *Titus* were *Bishop* of *Creet*, which was of old (ἑκατομπολις) the hundred-cityed Island, and *Timothy* of *Ephesus*, the Metropolis of *Asia*, the multitude of the territories under them, whiles it inlargeth their charge, doth detract nothing from the use of their office.

Secondly you tell us from learned D. *Raynolds*, *that the Fathers, when they called any Apostle Bishop, they meant it in a generall sort, and signification; because they did attend that church for a time, and supply that roome in preaching the Gospell, which Bishops did after not intending it, as it is commonly taken for the over-seer of a particular Church, and Pastor of a severall flocke*: but, what is this to *Timothy* and *Titus*? you say, the same may be said of them, but the Doctor gave you no leave so to apply it; neither do we. Although to say truth, all this discourse of yours is (ἐκτὸς ὅδε) needlesse and extravagant: whether *Timothy* or *Titus* were Evangelists,

geliſts, or no, ſure we are, that heere they ſtand for perſons charged with thoſe Offices, and cares which are delivered to the ordinary Church governours, in all ſucceeding generations: And we do moſt juſtly take them, as we finde them; and with our firſt confidence maintain, that we challenge no other ſpirituall power, then was delegated unto them, and unto the Angels of the *Aſian Churches*; you meane to confute us by queſtions; and thoſe ſo poore and frivolous, as are not worth anſwer; faſtning that upon ſome particular abuſe, which wee diſclaime from our calling; as if under this claime, wee were bound to juſtifie every act of a Biſhop. To anſwer you in your own kind: when, or where did our biſhops challenge power to ordaine alone, to govern alone? when (though you ignorantly turne an Elder in age, to an Elder in Office) did our Biſhops challenge power to paſſe a rough and unbeſeeming rebuke upon an Elder? Where did our Biſhops give Commiſſion to *Chancellors*, *Commiſſaries*, *Officials*, to rayle upon Presbyters, or to accuſe them without juſt grounds, and without legall proceedings?

As for your laſt queſtion, I muſt tell you it is no better raiſed then upon an ignorant negative. Did the Apoſtle ſay, reject none but an Heretick? Did he not wiſh would to God they were cut off that trouble you? Is it not certainly proved true, that ſome *Sciſmaticke* may be worſe then ſome *Hereticke*; which I ſpeak not ſo, as to traduce any of our unconforming brethren, whoſe conſciences are unſetled in the point of this mean difference, as guilty of that hatefull crime: but to convince the abſurdity of our queſtioniſts; after whoſe ill raiſed cavills, thus fully anſwered, we have no cauſe to feare, upon their ſuggeſtions, to bee diſclaimed as uſurpers.

From *Timothy* and *Titus* you deſcend to the Angels of the ſeven *Aſian* Churches; *which no ſubtilty at all*, but the common intereſt of their condition, hath twiſted together in our defence.

In the generality whereof I muſt premoniſh my Reader, that this Piece of the taſk fell unhappily upon ſome dull and tedious hand, that cared not how oft ſod Coleworts he diſhed out to his credulous gueſts;

I ſhall (what I may) prevent their ſurfet.

Your ſhift is, *that the Angel is here taken collectively, not individually*: A conceit, which if your ſelves, certainly no other wiſe man can ever believe; for if the intereſt be common and equally appertayning to all, why ſhould one be ſingled out above the reſt? If you will yeeld the perſon to be ſuch, as had more than others, a right in the adminiſtration of all, it is that we ſeeke for: Surely, it did in ſome ſort concerne all that was ſpoken to him, becauſe he had the charge of al: but the direction is individuall, as *Beza* himſelfe takes it; as if a Letter be indorſed from the Lords of the Counſaile to the Biſhop of *Durham* or *Salisbury*, concerning ſome affaires of the whole Clergy of their Dioceſſe, can we ſay that the name Biſhop, is there no other then a collective; becauſe the buſineſſe may import many? verily I do not believe that the Authors of this ſence can believe it themſelves. To your invincible proofes: In the Epiſtle to *Thyatira* you ſay it is written (ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς) *I ſay to you, and to the reſt*: where (*by you*) muſt (as you imagine) be ſignified, the Governours; Rev. 2. 24.

by the reſt, the people: but what if the better Copyes read, (ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς) *I ſay to you, the reſt in Thyatira*, without the copulative, as is confeſſed by your good friends; where then is your doughty Argument? Here are no diviſions of parties, but the Paſtor and Flock. And truly thus it is; and my own eyes have ſeen it, in that noble Manuſcript, written by the hand of *Tecla* (as is probably ſuppoſed) ſome 1300. years agoe, as *Cyrill*, the late renowned Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* avoweth; your goodly proof therefore is in the ſuds. But to meete with you in your own kinde, if you will goe upon divers Readings; what will you ſay to that *verſ* 20 where the Angel of *Thyatira* is encharged: Thou ſuffereſt τὴν γυναῖκα σου Ἰεζάβελ (*thy wife Iezebell*) (for ſo it is in very good Copies) *to teach and ſeduce*; yea ſo it is in that memorable Copy of *Tecla*, forementioned, which is to be ſeene in the Princes Library, under the cuſtody of the induſtrious and learned Mr. *Patrick Young*, as my owne eyes can witneſſe: and thus St. *Cyprian* reads it of olde: *What? ſhall wee thinke ſhee was wife to the whole company, or to one Biſhop alone?*

Cypr. l. 4. ad Antonianum Epiſt.

lone? I leave you to bluſh, for the ſhame this very proofe alone caſts upon your opinion: Secondly, you tell us, it is uſuall with the Holy Ghoſt, even in this very booke, to expreſſe a company under one ſingular perſon: as, *the Beaſt is the Civill ſtate; the Whore, and the falſe Prophet, the Eccleſiaſticall ſtate of Rome*: But what if it be thus in viſions, or emblematicall repreſentations? muſt it needs be ſo in plaine narrations, where it is limited by juſt Prædicates? or becauſe it is ſo in one phraſe of ſpeech, muſt it bee ſo in all? Why doe you not as well ſay, where the Lambe is named, or the Lion of *Juda*, this is a collective of many; not an individuall ſubject: The *ſeven Angels*, you ſay, *that blew the ſeven trumpets, and poured out the ſeven phialls, are not to bee taken literally, but ſynecdochically*; perhaps ſo, but then the *ſynecdoche* lyes in the ſeven, and not in the *Angels*; ſo I grant you the word *Angel*, is here metaphoricall; but you are no whit nearer to your imagined *ſynecdoche*.

The very name Angell, (you ſay) *is ſufficient*

proofe, that it is not meant of one perſon alone, as being a common name to all Gods Miniſters, and Meſſengers: As if he did not well know this that directed theſe Epiſtles: and if hee had ſo meant it, had it not been as eaſie to have mentioned more as one? Had he ſaid, *the Angels of the Church of Epheſus*, or *Thyatira*, the cauſe had been cleare: now, hee ſayes *the Angell* ὁ ἄγγελος the denoted perſon muſt be ſingular; for ſurely you cannot ſay that all the Presbyters at *Epheſus* were one *Angel*: The ſame reaſon holds for the Stars: had he ſaid, *to the Star of Epheſus*, I ſuppoſe no body would have conſtrued it of many, but of one eminent perſon: Now he ſpeaks of ſo many Stars, as *Angels*, to wit, ſeven in thoſe ſeven Churches.

Your fourth Argument from the Text it ſelfe, is no better then ridiculous: poorely drawn from what it doth not ſay: Lo, hee ſaith, *the 7. Candleſticks which thou ſaweſt are the 7. Churches*: but he doth not ſay, the *7. Stars* are the *7. Angels* of the ſeven Churches: but, *the Angels of the 7. Churches*. Forbear, if you can, Readers, to ſmile at this curious ſubtilty: becauſe, the *ſeven* is not twice

Revel. 1. 20.

twice repeated, in mentioning the *Angels*, there is a deep myſtery in the omiſſion: what Cabaliſme have we here? Had he ſaid, *the ſeven Stars are the ſeven Angels of the ſeven churches*, now, all had been ſure; but he ſaith not ſo, but onely thus; *the ſeven Stars are the Angels of the ſeven Churches*, It is plaine, that every Church hath his Angell mentioned, and there being ſeven Churches how many Angels, I beſeech you, are there? now becauſe he doth not ſay expreſſely in termes, *ſeven Angels of the ſeven Churches*, we are foyled in our proofe; judge Reader, what to expect of ſo deep ſpeculations.

Laſtly, *it is evident* (you ſay) *though but one Angell be mentioned in the front, yet the Epiſtles themſelves be dedicated to all the Angels and Miniſters, and to the Churches themſelves*; who ever doubted it? the foot of every Epiſtle runs (*what the ſpirit ſaith unto the Churches*) not to one Church, but to all ſeven: If therfore you argue, that the name *Angel* is collective, ſay alſo that every of theſe ſeaven Angels, is the whole company of all the ſeaven Churches; which were a foule nonſence; you might have ſaved the labour both

both of *Auſbertus*, and the reſt of your Authors, and your own; we never thought otherwiſe, but that the whole Church is ſpoken to; but ſo, as that the Governour or Biſhop is ſingled out, as one that hath the maine ſtroke in ordering the affairs thereof, and is therefore either praiſed, or challenged, according to his carriage therein; although alſo there are ſuch particularities both of commendations, and exceptions, in the body of the ſeverall Epiſtles, as cannot but have relation to thoſe ſeverall Over-ſeers, to whom they were endorſed, as I have elſe where ſpecified; Had all the Presbyters of *Epheſus* loſt their firſt love; had each of them tryed the falſe Apoſtles? Had all thoſe of *Sardis* a name to live, and were dead? Were all the *Laodicean* Miniſters of one temper? theſe taxations were no doubt of individuall perſons, but ſuch as in whom the whole Churches were intereſſed.

As for thoſe conjecturall reaſons, which you frame to your ſelves, why the whole company of Presbyters ſhould be written to under the ſingular name of an *Angel*, if yee

pleaſe

pleaſe your ſelves with them, it is well, from me they have no cauſe to expect an anſwer: they neither can draw my aſſent, nor merit my confutation.

Take heed of yeelding that, which ye cannot but yield to be granted by D. *Raynolds*, & Mr. *Beza*, Doctor *Fulke*, *Pareus*, and others, that the *Angel* is here taken individually; but ſtill if you be wiſe, hold your own; that our cauſe is no whit advanced, nor yours impaired by this yieldance: Let him have been an *Angell*, yet what makes this for a Dioceſan Biſhop? much every way: For if the Church of *Epheſus* (for example) had many Miniſters or Presbyters in it to inſtruct the people in their ſeverall charges, (as it is manifeſt they had) and yet but one prime Over-ſeer, which is ſingled out by the Spirit of God, and ſtiled by a title of eminence, the *Angel of that Church*, it muſt needs follow, that in St. *Johns* time there was an acknowledged ſuperiority in the government of the Church: if there were many *Angels* in each, and yet but one that was the *Angel*, who can make doubt of an inequality?

It is but a pittifull ſhift that you make, in pleading *that theſe* Angels (if Biſhops) *yet were not Dioceſan Biſhops; for that Pariſhes were not divided into Dioceſſes* (I had thought Dioceſes ſhould have been divided into Pariſhes rather) *in S.* Iohns *dayes*: for by the ſame reaſon, I may as well argue, that they were not Parochial Biſhops neither, ſince that then no Pariſhes were as yet diſtinguiſhed: As if you had reſolved to ſpeak nothing but Bulls, and Soloeciſmes; you tell me, *that the ſeven Stars are ſaid to be fixed in their ſeven Candleſticks*; whereas thoſe Stars are ſaid to bee in the right hand of the Son of God: But (ſay you ſtill) *not one Star was over divers Candleſticks*: Truly no; who ever ſaid, that one Angel was over all the ſeven Churches? but that each of theſe famous Churches were under their own Star, or Angel; but *thoſe churches* (you ſay) *were not Dioceſan*: How doth that appeare? *Becauſe firſt Tindal, and the old tranſlation calls them ſeven congregations*: for anſwer, who knows not that *Tindall*, and the old Tranſlation are ſtill wont to tranſlate the word *church*, whereſoever they finde it, by *Congregation*, which ſome Papiſts have layd

laid in our diſh: Learned Doctor *Fulk* hath well cleared our intentions herein from their cenſure: *Tindall* himſelfe profeſſes to doe it out of this reaſon, becauſe the Popiſh Clergy had appropriated to themſelves the name of the Church; but however, they rather made uſe of the Word; yet not ſo as that hereby they intend onely to ſignifie Pariſhionall meetings. So *Epheſians* 3. To the intent that now to the Rulers and Powers in heavenly places, might bee knowne by the Congregation, the manifold Wiſedome of GOD; Doe wee thinke this bleſſed Revelation confined to a Pariſh, or common to the whole Church of God? So 1. *Corinthians* 15. they turne, *I am not worthy to bee called an Apoſtle, becauſe I perſecuted the Congregation of GOD*: Doe we thinke his cruelty was confined to a Pariſh? So *Matthew* 6. 16. *Vpon this Rocke will I build my Congregation*: was this a Pariſh onely? So *Acts* 11. *Herod the King ſtretched out his hands to vexe certaine of the Congregation*: Was his malice onely Parochiall? but ſecondly, ye tell us, that in *Epheſus*, which was one of thoſe

Candleſticks, there was but one flock. *Acts* 20. 28. Yea, but can you tell us what kind of Flock it was, whether Nationall, or Provinciall, or Dioceſan? Parochiall (I am ſure) it could not be: you have heard before, that thoſe Elders or Biſhops were ſent for from *Epheſus*: But that they were all of *Epheſus* it cannot be proved; when all of them then are bidden to take heede to the Flocke of Chriſt, whereof they are made over-ſeers, each is herein charged to look to his owne; and all are in the next words required to feed the Church of GOD, which he hath purchaſed with his owne blood. So as your ſecond argument is fully anſwered in the ſolution of the firſt, and in the former paſſages of this Section. The advantage that you take from *Epiphanius*, affirming that divers Cities of that time might have two Biſhops, whereas Alexandria held cloſe to one, can availe you little, when it ſhall bee well weighed; firſt, that your Tenet ſuppoſeth and requireth that every Preſbyter ſhould bee a Biſhop, and therefore (if your cauſe ſpeed) there ſhould be no fewer

er Biſhops than pariſhes. Secondly, that the practiſe of the whole Church, both before and after *Epiphanius*, is by ſuch cleare teſtimonies convinced to be contrary: famous, and irrefragable, is that Canon of *Nicen* Councell, ἵνα μὴ, &c. that in one City there might not bee two Biſhops: ſo before this, *Cornelius* writing to the Biſhop of *Antioch* objects it ſcornfully to Novatian, that hee did not know ἵνα ἐπίσκοπον δεῖ εἶναι, &c. that in a Catholike Church there ought to be but one Biſhop; And it is a knowne word of the Confeſſors of old, in *Cyprians* time, one GOD, one Lord, one Biſhop: Make much (if you pleaſe) of this conceit of yours, that *Epiphanius* his Neighbour-hood might acquaint him well with the Condition of the *Aſian* Churches: But let mee adde, that you ſhall approve your ſelves meere ſtangers to all the rules and practiſes of antiquity: if you ſhall ſtand upon the generall plurality of Biſhops in the ſame City, or Dioces: And laſt of all, remember, that *Epiphanius* reckons up *Ærius* as an Hereticke, for holding Presbyters equall with Biſhops. *Conc. Nic. can. 8*

Your third argument, *that there is nothing ſaid in theſe ſeven Epiſtles, that implyes a ſuperiority*, is anſwered by the very Superſcription of each Letter, which is, τῷ Ἀγγέλῳ *To the Angel*: and much more by the matter of the ſeverall Epiſtles: For what reaſon were it for an ordinary Presbyter to bee taxed for that, which hee hath no power to redreſſe? That the *Angel* of *Pergamus* ſhould bee blamed for the having of thoſe which hold the Doctrine of *Balaam* or the *Nicolaitans*, when hee had no power to proceed againſt them? or the *Angel* of the Church of *Thyatira*, for ſuffering the Woman *Jezabel*, (if it muſt bee ſo read) to teach, and ſeduce, when hee had no power of publick cenſure to reſtraine her? But what need wee ſtand upon conjecturall anſwers, to convince you in this plea, as likewiſe in the ſuppoſed Deciſion of the kinde of ſuperiority, which you urge in the next paragraph; when wee are able to ſhew both who the parties were, to whom ſome of theſe Epiſtles were directed, and to evince the high degree of their ſuperiority; *Ignatius* the Martyr

Martyr (beſides *Tertullian*) is witneſſe for both, who tells us that *Oneſimus* was now the *Angel* or *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*, *Polycarpus* of *Smyrna*; and as commenting upon this very ſubject, oft ingeminates the duty of ſubjection owing to the Biſhop; and the divers degrees of thoſe 3 ſeveral ſtations in the Church; as we already inſtanced; away then with thoſe your unproving illuſtrations, and unregardable teſtimonies, which you (as deſtitute of all Antiquity) ſhut up the Scene withall: And let the wiſe Reader judge, whether the *Remonſtrant* hath not from the evidence of *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the Angels, of the *Aſian* Churches, made good that juſt claime of this ſacred Hierarchy, againſt all your weak and frivolous pretentions. From the *Remonſtrant* (leaſt your diſcourſe ſhould not be tedious enough) you fly upon ſome other Defenders of the Hierarchy, and fall upon the two poſt-ſcripts of Saint *Pauls* Epiſtles (to *Timothy* and *Titus*, wherein *Timothy* & *Titus* are ſtiled the firſt biſhops of *Epheſus*, and *Creet*) which I am no way engaged to defend: You ſay *they are not of canonical authority*; ſo ſay I too; but I ſay they are of great

Ignat. ad Epheſ. ἐν Ὀνησίμῳ τῷ ἐπ' ἀγάπῃ ἀδίῃ ἡγοῦμαι ὑμᾶς ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ &c.

great antiquity,& ſo you muſt confeſſe alſo.

Faine would I ſee but any pretence of ſo much age againſt the matter of thoſe Subſcriptions: the averred Epiſcopacy of *Timothy* and *Titus*, cited by theſe confident antiquaries:ſurely he were ſenceles, that would imagine the Poſt-ſcripts as old as the Text, or as authenticke; but we may boldly ſay they are older then any Records of the gainſayers.

Where theſe Subſcriptions are not ſeconded by authority of the ancient Church, there I leave them; but where they are ſo wel backed, there is no reaſon to forſake them. The Exception therefore which you take at the Poſt ſcript of the Epiſtle to *Titus*, is not more ſtale than unjuſt. You ſay peremptorily, it was not written from *Nicopolis*; neither was *Paul* then there: how appeares it? Becauſe hee ſayes in the body of the Epiſtle, come to mee to *Nicopolis*, for I am determined there to winter: Hee ſaith not, Heere to Winter, but there: as ſpeaking of a third place: but how ſlight this ground is, will bee eaſily apparent to

to any man that ſhall conſider, that Saint *Paul* was in perpetuall journying from place to place: And therfore, though now at that inſtant at *Nicopolis*, yet how ſoone occaſions might call him away, and how long, hee knew not: Therefore it was moſt fit that he ſhould pitch upon a certaine place, whither *Titus* ſhould direct his way toward him: Notwithſtanding your gheſſe therefore, ſince holy *Athanaſius* plainely tells us, that S. *Paul* wrote this Epiſtle from *Nicopolis*; and is therein followed by *Oecumenius*, and *Theophylact*, and in that famous ancient Manuſcript, ſent by the late Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; I finde it plainly dated ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως. It muſt needes follow, that either this Subſcription was before *Athanaſius* and *Teclaes* time; or elſe that they went upon ſome other good ground of their aſſertion.

Laſtly, it may well goe for a reaſon of your owne making, that the Poſt-ſcript ſtiles *Titus* Biſhop of the Church of the

Cretians; whereas it would be ſaid of the Churches of the Cretians; for the Chriſtian Churches, of any Nation, are called by *Luke* and *Paul* Churches, and not Church: Who would not yeelde you this truth, that the Chriſtian Churches are called Churches? What can they bee called elſe, when they are mentioned in their ſeverall diverſities; but when they are upon ſome intire Relation, conjoyned & united, as theſe of *Creet*, under one Government, theymay well bee called not the Churches, but the Church. That flaſh of Wit might well have beene forborne, wherein you make an envious Compariſon *Betwixt the Authority of theſe Subſcriptions, and Epiſcopall authority, of urging Subſcription to their Ceremonies*: And why theirs, I beſeech you? Have you beene urged to ſubſcribe to any other Ceremonies, than have been eſtabliſhed by the Lawes of this Realme & Church? Was it Epiſcopall power that enacted them? Had you beene but as obedient, theſe Ceremonies had beene equally yours:

yours: Now out of pure Love you impoſe that upon us, which you repined that the Lawes ſhould impoſe upon you: Goe on thus Charitably & proſper.

Becauſe you wanted Worke from the *Remonſtrance*, you will cut out ſome for your ſelves: An Objection of your owne muſt be anſwered; That is, *From the inequalitie that was betweene the Twelve Apoſtles, and the ſeaventy Diſciples*: And wel may you ſhape and faſhion your owne Anſwere unto your owne Objection: *It cannot bee prooved*, (you ſay) *that the Twelve had any Superiority over the Seaventy, eyther of Ordination, or Juriſdiction.* What? have you forgotten, brethren, that the Apoſtles ordained the Decons, *Acts 6.6. by Praier and impoſition of hands?* That the Apoſtle *Paul* laid his hands on *Timothy?* Have you forgotten how by vertue of his Apoſtleſhippe hee char-

ges, Commands, Controlles, Cenſures? What is, if this bee not Ordination and Juriſdiction? But (ſay you) ſuppoſe it were ſo; yet a ſuperiority and inferiority betweene Officers of different kindes, will not prove a ſuperiority and inferiority betweene Officers of the ſame kinde. Deeply argued; Surely hence you may inferre, that one Biſhop is not ſuperiour to another; nor one Preſbyter above another; but that a Biſhop ſhould not bee ſuperiour to a Presbyter, were an uncouth conſequence: If the twelve Apoſtles therefore were ſuperiours to the 70. Diſciples, and Biſhops (as your owne *Jerome* tells you) ſucceed thoſe Apoſtles, and Presbyters come in the roome of the ſeventy, where is that identity or ſameneſſe of kind which you pretend? All Antiquity hath acknowledged, τρεῖς βάθμους three ſeverall rankes in the Church-Hierarchy; and if you have a minde

Cyprian, Epicopi loquens, &c. Qui Apoſtolis vicaria ordinatione ſuccedunt. Ep. 69. Unitas per Apoſtolos novis ſucceſſoribus tradita. Ep. 41 Meminiſſe debent Diaconi quoniam Apoſtolos i. e. Epiſcopos & præpoſitos Dominus elegit. Ep. 65.

a minde to jumble them together, take away the difference betwixt Presbyters, and Deacons, as well as that betwixt Biſhops and Presbyters, *Jam ſumus ergo pares.*

And now wee appeale to the ſame Barre, how farre you have beene from diſproving the Divine right, or Apoſtolicall inſtitution of Epiſcopacy; and whether your relyance upon *Hieromes* Authority in this poynt hath beene grounded upon any other reaſon, but your owne weak preſumption. Yet ſtill like (as I have heard) ſome beaten Cocks, you dare crow; and tell your Reader, that though Scriptures faile us, yet wee ſupport our ſelves by the indulgence and munificence of religious Princes: ſurely, if GOD ſhould have withdrawne himſelfe, in vaine ſhould wee make fleſh our armes: Our calling we challenge from God: ſome acceſſory Titles, Dignities, Maintenance, we

thankfully profeſſe to have received from the bountie of Royall Benefactors: What of this? *Herein*, you ſay, *the Author acknowledgeth a difference, betweene our Biſhops, and the Biſhops of old.* Yes verily, ſo hee gladly doth, with all humble thankefulneſſe to God, and good Princes: make your beſt of this conceſſion. Suddainly you fall faire, and profeſſe your well-pleaſedneſſe, with the liberall maintenance of the Church, although ſomewhat yet ſticks with you: When the Miniſtery came to have *agros, domos, locationes, vehicula*, as you ſay from *Chryſoſtome*, then *Religio peperit divitias*, Religion brought forth riches, and the Daughter devoured the Mother; and a voice was heard from heaven, *Hodie venenum*: and then You tell us of *woodden Prieſts, and golden challices* But, Brethren, take no care for this danger; our laſt age hath begun to take ſufficient order for the redreſſe

dreſſe of this Evill: and if in time You ſhall ſee Wooden Chalices, and Wooden Prieſts, thanke your ſelves.

However, you grant there is not an incompoſſibility betwixt large Revenues, and an humble Sociableneſſe; yet You ſay, *it is rare*; and tell us, That *the rich Proviſion of Biſhops hath uſhered in, both neglect of their Miniſtery, and Pompous attendance, and inſultation over their Brethren*: And You inſtance in the pride of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, and ſhut up with the grave complaint of *Sulpitius Severus*. It is not to be denied, Brethren, that ſome ſuch ill uſe hath beene made, by ſome, of their abundance: but ſurely, in this ablative age, the fault is rare, and hardly inſtanceable; both the Wings and train of many of ours have beene ſo Clipped, that there is no great feare of flying high. But if it bee ſo, the fault is fixed to the perſon, who with more grace might otherwiſe improve

prove the bleſſing. Caſt your eyes upon others, even your owne great Patrons, and tell mee if you doe not eſpie the ſame ill uſe of large meanes, and flattering proſperity; yet you deſire not to abridge their ſtore, but to rectifie the imployment of it: Learne to be ſo charitable to your ſpirituall ſuperiors.

And now at laſt you give a *vale* to your *Remonſtrants* Arguments, and ſhut up with a bold recollection, concerning which, let mee ſay thus much; Truely, Brethren, had you as good a faculty in ſtrewing, as you have in gathering, there were no dealing with you: but it is your ill hap to tell the reader in your recapitulation of great feates that you have done in your former diſcourſe, when as he muſt needs profeſſe that he ſees no ſuch matter. I appeal to his judicious eies, whether in all this tedious paſſage, you have proved any thing but your owne bold ignorance, and abſurd inconſequences.

SECT.

SECT. XIV.

MY ſatisfaction to objections comes next to be ſcanned; Objections, which would to God they were onely of my own framing.

In the firſt, That Epiſcopacy is no prejudice of Soveraigntie, I juſtly prove, for that there is a compatibleneſſe in this caſe of Gods act, and the Kings. It is God that makes the Biſhop, the King that gives the Biſhoprick: what can you ſay to this?

You tell us you have already proved that God never made a biſhop, as hee ſtands in *ſuperiority over Presbyters*, ſo you told us; and that is enough, we were hard hearted if wee would not believe you: When as wee have made good by undeniable proofes, that (beſides the grounds which our Saviour laid of this imparity) the bleſſed Apoſtles by inſpiration from God, made this difference in a perſonall ordaining of ſome above the reſt, and giving expreſſe charge of Ordination and Iuriſdiction to thoſe

ſelect perſons, in Church government, the Biſhops have ever ſince ſucceeded.

Tell us not therefore, *that if wee diſclaim the influence of Soveraignty into our Creation, and aſſert that the King doth not make us Biſhops, wee muſt have no beeing at all*; For, that the Reader may ſee you ſtop your owne mouth; anſwer me, I beſeech you, Where, or when ever did the King create a Biſhop? name the man, and take the cauſe. It pleaſes his Majeſtie to give his *Congedelier* for a Biſhops Election to his See, to ſignifie his Royall aſſent thereunto; upon which the Biſhop is ſolemnly ordained by the impoſition of the hands of the Metropolitan, and other his Brethren; and theſe doe, as from God, inveſt him in his holy Calling, which he exerciſes in that place, which is deſigned and given by his Majeſtie: What can be more plaine then this truth? As for that unworthy cenſure which you paſſe upon the juſt compariſon of Kings in order to Biſhops, and Patrons in order to their Clerks, it ſhall be acknowledged, well deſerved, if you ſhall be able to make good the diſparity; *When hee ſhall prove* (you ſay)

that

that the Patron gives Miniſteriall power to his Clerke, as the King gives Epiſcopall power to the Biſhop, it may bee of ſome conducement to his cauſe: Shortly, brethren, the ſame day that you ſhall ſhew mee that the King ordained a biſhop, the ſame day will I ſhew you that a Patron ordained a Presbyter: The Patron gives the benefice to the one, The King gives the biſhopricke to the other: neither of them do give the Office, or Calling to either. Goe you therefore with your Frier *Simon*, to your Cell, and conſult with your Covent for more reaſon and wit, then you ſhew in this, and the next ſcornfull *Paragraph*; wherein whiles you flout at my modeſt conceſſion with an unbeſeeming frump, you are content ſilently to balke that my ſecond anſwer, which you know was too hot, or too heavie for your ſatiſfaction.

In the ſecond; the Imputation pretended to bee caſt by this Tenet upon al the reformed Churches, which want this governement, I indevoured ſo to ſatisfie, that I might juſtly decline the envy, which is intended to be thereby raiſed againſt us: For which cauſe, I profeſſed that wee doe love

and honour thoſe our ſiſter Churches, as the dear ſpouſe of Chriſt, and give zealous teſtimonies of my well wiſhing to them.

Your uncharitableneſſe offers to choake me with thoſe ſcandalous cenſures, and diſgracefull terms which ſome of ours have let fall upon thoſe Churches, and their eminent profeſſors, which I confeſſe, it is more eaſie to be ſorry for, then (on ſome hands) to excuſe; The errour of a few may not bee imputed to all.

My juſt defence is that no ſuch conſequent can be drawne from our opinion; for as much as the Divine or Apoſtolicall right, which wee hold, goes not ſo high, as if there were an expreſſe command, that upon an abſolute neceſſity there muſt bee either Epiſcopacy, or no Church; but ſo far only, that it both may and ought to be; How fain would you heere finde mee in a contradiction? Whiles I one-where reckon Epiſcopacy amongſt matters eſſential to the Church, another where, deny it to be of the eſſence thereof; Wherein you willingly hide your eys that you may not ſee the diſtinction that I make expreſly betwixt the Being & Well-beeing

beeing of a Church: Affirming that thoſe Churches, to whom this power and faculty is denied, loſe nothing of the true eſſence of a Church, though they miſſe ſomething of their glory, and perfection.

No, Brethren, it is enough for ſome of your friends to hold their Diſcipline altogether eſſentiall to the very being of a Church; We dare not be ſo zealous.

The queſtion which you aske concerning the reaſon of the different intertainment, given in our Church to prieſts converted to us from *Rome*, and to Miniſters, who in Qu. *Maries* dayes had received Impoſition of hands in Reformed Churches abroad, is meerely perſonall; neither can challenge my deciſion; Onely I give you theſe two anſwers; that what fault ſoever may bee in the eaſie admittance of thoſe, who have received *Romiſh* Orders, the ſticking at the admiſſion of our brethren returning from Reformed Churches, was not in caſe of Ordination; but of Inſtitution: they had beene acknowledged Miniſters of Chriſt, without any other hands layed upon them, but according to

the Lawes of our Land they were not, perhaps, capable of inſtitution to a benefice, unleſſe they were ſo qualified, as the Statutes of this Realme doe require; And ſecondly I know thoſe, more then one, that by vertue onely of that Ordination, which they have brought with them from other Reformed Churches, have enjoyed Spirituall Promotions and Livings without any exception againſt the lawfulneſſe of their calling.

B. Montague

The confident affirmation which you alleage of the learned biſhop of *Norwich* is no rule to us; I leave him to his owne defence; You think I have too much work on my hand to give ſatisfaction for my ſelfe in theſe two main Queſtions which ariſe from my book.

What high points ſhall wee now expect trow wee?

Firſt, whether that Office, which by divine right hath ſole power of Ordination, and ruling all other Officers of the Church (which hee ſayth Epiſcopacy hath) *belong not to the being, but onely to the glorie, and perfection of a Church*: Can wee tell what theſe men would have? Have

Have they a minde to goe beyond us in aſſerting that neceſſity, and eſſentiall uſe of Epiſcopacy, which we dare not avow? Do they not care to loſe their cauſe, ſo *they may croſſe* an Adverſary? For *your* Queſtion, *you* ſtil talke of ſole Ordination, and ſole juriſdiction; *you* may (*if you pleaſe*) keepe that paire of ſoles for *your* next ſhooes: VVee contend not for ſuch an height of *Propriety*, neither do we practiſe it; they are ſo ours, that they ſhould not bee without us, as we have *formerly ſhewed*; That therefore there ſhould bee a power of lawfull Ordination and government in every ſetled Church, it is no leſſe then neceſſary, but that in what caſe ſoever of extremity, and irreſiſtible neceſſitie, this ſhould be only done by Epiſcopall hands, we never meant to affirme: It is enough that *regularly* it ſhould be their Act.

Your ſecond Queſtion is, *There being* (in this mans thoughts) *the ſame* jus Divinum *for Biſhops, that there is for Paſtors and Elders, whether, if thoſe Reformed Churches, wanted Paſtors and Elders too, they ſhould want nothing of the eſſence of a Church; but of the Perfection, and Glory of it*: The anſwere is ready: If thoſe

thoſe Reformed Churches, wanting thoſe whom you call paſtors and Elders, did yet injoy the government, by Biſhops, Prieſts & Deacons, they ſhould be ſo far from wanting ought of the eſſence of a Church, that they ſhould herein attain to much glory and perfection : And ſo much for your deepe queſtions.

The preſumptuous Remonſtrant would ſeeme to know ſo much of the minde of thoſe Churches, that hee ſaith, *if they might have their option, he doubts not but they would gladly embrace Epiſcopall government*; a foule imputation which your Zeale muſt needes wipe off; for which purpoſe you bring the confeſſions of the *French*, and *Dutch* Churches, averring the truth, and juſtifiableneſſe of their owne government; For which they have good reaſon: neither ſhall you herein expect my contradiction; nor yet my preſent labour of reconciling their governement, and ours in the maine and materiall points of both; This condition they are in, and they doe well to defend it, but they did not tell you they would not (if oportunity were offered) be content with a better; I am deceived

deceived if their own publicke Conſtitutions be not ſtill concluded with the power of a Change; and I have elſewhere ſhewed out of *Fregevillæus*, that this Order of Government was in their Churches at firſt only proviſionall; and inſtanced in thoſe teſtimonies of approbation, which their learned Divines have freely given to our forme of Adminiſtration; which I ſhal not now ſtand either to repeate, or multiply: Let it be enough for the preſent to ſay, that upon my certain knowledg, many eminent Divines of the Churches abroad have earneſtly wiſhed themſelves in our condition, and have applauded and magnified our Church, as the moſt Famous, Exemplary and glorious Church in the whole Chriſtian World: So as I wanted not good reaſon, for that which you are pleaſed to ſtile preſumptuous aſſertion.

But the reaſon of my Aſſertion is yet ſo more offenſive, that you Wonder how it could fall from my Pen:

That there is little difference in the government of other Proteſtant Churches and our owne, ſave in the perpetuity of their Moderator-

ſhip, and the excluſion of Lay Elders; *A paſſage, belike*, as you ſay, *of admirable abſurdity*. But ſoft, brethren, I am afraid, firſt, leaſt you ſpeake of what you know not; I ſpeak not onely of the next Churches of *Fraunce*, and the *Netherland*, I ſpeake of them in a generalitie, as one that (if this place would bear it) could give a particular account of them all: Neither can your cavills worke my repentance. You tell me of the Moderatour in *Geneva* (as if all the Church of God were included in thoſe ſtrait walls) I could tell you of the ſuperintendents of the Churches of *Germany*, of the *Prepoſiti* in the Churches of *Weteraw*, *Heſſia*, *Anhalt*, of the *Seniores*, in *Tranſylvania*, *Polonia*, *Bohemia*; But what of the Moderator in *Geneva*? *Hee is not of a Superiour Order to his Brethren*; But let mee tell you, when Maſter *Calvin* was Moderatour there, as hee conſtantly was for many yeeres, no Biſhop in *England* ſwayed more, then he did in that Church: And even in the Low Countries how much the *Deputati Synodi*, after they had beene frequently imployed in thoſe ſervices, (as for inſtance, my ancient and truly

ly

ly reverend friend Mr. *Bogermannus*) prevailed) & with what authority they carrie the affaires of the Church, it is not hard to underſtand; for thoſe other circumſtances, which you are pleaſed to mention, were the moderatorſhip perpetuall; they would ſoon accordingly vary; and if not ſo, yet you may remember, that I ſaid not, no difference at all, but, little, whereof your well affectednes to our Government can make this uſe, *that then the Abrogation of Epiſcopacy will be wrought with the leſſe difficulty, and occaſion the leſſe diſturbance*; The old word is; welfare a friend in a corner; ſtill you are for the deſtructive; none but the *Babylonian* note ſounds well in your eare, *Downe with it, downe with it, even to the ground*: But the God of Heaven whoſe cauſe it is, will, we hope, vindicate his owne ordinance, ſo long perpetuated to his Church, from all your violent and ſubtile machinations, and prevent the utmoſt danger of your already ſufficiently raiſed diſturbance.

SECT

SECT. XV.

CONcerning the Lay Presbitery I ſaid, and ſay ſtill moſt juſtly, that it never had footing in the Church of God till *this preſent age*: Theſe wits *cry out* in great ſport, *See, ſee, how like the man lookes to Doctor* Hall, *in his irrefragable Propoſitions?* Truely, brethren, as like him, as yee are like your ſelves: who are ſtill ſcornfull and inſolent: but though yee be commonly ſpightful, yet you are ſo ſeldome *witty*, that we may well bear with *you* for once: be he like *whom hee will*; Dr. *Hall* will ſufficiently defend both thoſe Propoſitions, and this Remonſtrance againſt all your impotent cavils: For this, concerning the queſtioned Lay-presbitery, You make a faire flouriſh to little purpoſe: You do wiſely to omit thoſe three knowne Texts, which the world knows have beene ſo throughly canvaſed and eluded, and that famous Text of an acknowledged counterfeit, *Ambroſe*, ſo often exploded: wee ſhall have now new ſtuffe from You, but of as little

little worth: Sutely had the fore-going Patrons of your Lay-Elderſhip found that they could have received any colour of *protection* from theſe places of Antiquity, alleaged by *you*, they had not, after the raking of all the channels of time, forborn the utmoſt urging of theſe Your Teſtimonies, in their favour and defence; but *they* well ſaw how little reaſon there was, to preſſe thoſe unproving evidences, which you will needs urge as convictive.

Your teſtimony from *Origen* cannot but ſhame *you*, if yet *you* can bluſh; *you* feared to cite the Chapter, that in ſo long a book, *you* might not be diſcovered. *Orig. contra Celſum c. 14.*

But the ſcope of the place is clearly thus. *Origen* is upon compariſon of the Philoſophers and Chriſtians in their care of teaching; *Nam illi* (ſcil. *Philoſophi*) *propalam apud vulgus differentes non ſunt curioſi in diſcernendis auditoribus*, &c. For the Philoſophers, ſaith hee, in their publick diſcourſes to the people are not curious in the differences of their *Auditors*, but every one that liſts, comes and heares them at pleaſure: *But* the Chriſtians doe, what they may, carefully pre-

examine the mindes of thoſe that deſire to heare them: and firſt they doe privately ſo to thoſe which are bewitched (with Paganiſme) before they bee received into the Congregation; And when they ſeeme to have come on ſo farre, as to be deſirous to live honeſtly, then doe they bring them in; but in diſtinct degrees; the one of thoſe which are newly admitted, but have not yet attained (the cognizance of their Purification,) Baptiſme; the other of thoſe which are now come on ſo farre as to profeſſe the Chriſtian Religion; in this latter ranke are appointed ſome, which do inquire into the lives and manners of thoſe that come; that they may be a meanes to keepe off ſuch Candidates of Religion as doe carry themſelves amiſſe, from their Aſſemblies: And the reſt that are like themſelves, they may gladly receive: In which paſſage it is moſt evident that *Origen* ſpeakes of thoſe which are newly admitted into the Church, who by reaſon of their late knowledge and acquaintance with thoſe which they left behinde them in Pagan ſuperſtition, might bee fit Monitours to knowe,

and

and notifie the condition of ſuch Candidates as did offer to come into the Church; Now theſe truſty Anſwerers would make the World believe, that this is ſpoken of ſome Sage Elders, that were to governe the Church; and (to deceive the Reader) unfaithfully turne the words, *Nonnulli Præpoſiti ſunt*, as if they were ſome ruling Elders indeed; Whereas the word ſignifies, and intends onely a deſignation of ſuch Novices as were well approved, to an Office of Monitorſhip concerning thoſe which would profeſſe to bee Converts. And now to return your owne words, wee would gladly knowe whether theſe were not, as it were, Lay Elders. πλαγιῶς.

As for thoſe other teſtimonies, which you have drawne hither out of *Auguſtine*, *Optatus*; and the Letters of *Fortis*, and *Purpurius* out of *Baronius*; I could, if neede were, double your files in this kinde, might that doe you any ſervice, I could tell you out of the acts of the Purgation of *Fœlix* and *Cæcilianus*, of *Epiſcopi*, *Presbyteri*, *Diaconi*, *Seniores*; out of *Vide Juſtellum, in notis ad Canon. African.*

the

the Synodal Epiſtle of the *Cabarſuſſitan coun-cell* (as mentioned by Saint *Auguſtine* in his Enarration upon the Pſalmes) *Neceſſe nos fuerat Primiani cauſam Seniorum literis ejuſdem Eccleſiæ poſtulantibus, audire atque diſcutere*; which is a more pregnant place then any you have brought; and could reckon You up yet more, out of the Code of the African Canons, *Can.* 91. Out of *Gregory Turonenſis*, who ſpeaking of the Biſhop of *Marſelles* brings him in to ſay, *Nihil per me feci, &c.* I did nothing of my ſelfe, but that which was commaunded me *à Dominis noſtris, & Senioribus*. Out of *Gregory* the great in his Epiſtles more then once, I could weary you with ſupply of ſuch authorities: But, Brethren, I ſhal ſadly tel you, that you do herein nothing but abuſe your Reader, with a colourable pretence: For all thoſe places you alleage, are nothing at all to the purpoſe in hand. VVho can make queſtion but that *Carthage* and *Hippo*, and other African Cities, had old and grave men in them? VVho can doubt that they had Magiſtrates and men in authority? Such, as we ſtil are wont out of the ancient appellation, to

ſtile

ſtyle *Aldermen*? Who can doubt that they did in all great occaſions of the Church take the adviſe, and aſſiſtance of theſe prime men? But will it hence follow that in the ſenſe you contend for, they had a *Setled Lay Presbytery*? Was their Church ere the more (according to your conſtruction) governed by *Paſtors*, *Elders*, *Deacons*? That theſe forecitedwere ſuch, as we have intimated, is moſt evident; in the *African* Canons (Can. 100) they are called ἡγούμενοι the old men. And in the 91 Canon, we find as a Commentary upon this point, *Debere unumquemque noſtrum in civitate ſua convenire Donatiſtarum Præpoſitos, aut adjungere ſibi vicinum Collegam, ut pariter eos in ſingulis quibuſque Civitatibus per Magiſtratus, vel Seniores locorum conveniant*. That is, That every one of us ſhould in our own Cities meet with the chiefe Governours of the *Donatiſts*, and take with him ſome neighbour as his Colleague or Aſſiſtant, that they together may give them a meeting by the Magiſtrates or Elders of the places.

But you will ſay, there were thoſe which

were called *Seniores Eccleſiaſtici*; eccleſiaſticall Elders alſo; True, there were ſuch, *Iuſtellus* confeſſes ſo much, and learned *Iſaacus Cauſabonus* (whoſe manuſcript notes I have ſeene,) and his worthy Sonne, *Mericus Cauſabonus* in his notes upon *Optatus*, yield no leſſe, but theſe they do truly ſay, were but as our Church-wardens, men that were truſted with the utenſils, ſtock, and outward affairs of the Church; or, as I may more fully compare them, our veſtrymen: who are commonly and of old deſigned under the name of the eight men, or twelve men, in every great pariſh (as I am ſure it is in the Weſtern parts) to order the buſineſſes of Seats, and rates, and ſuch like externall occaſions; now that thoſe places which you have cited intend no other Elders, then theſe, you ſhall he convinced out of your own teſtimonies.

διακόνων ἀλλ' ἐπισκόπων ἢ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τὰ γερόντων ἦν τοῖς ἀνδράσι τοῖς συνέδροις. *Can. Afr.* 91

Aug. contra Creſcon. l. 3. *Omnes vos Epiſcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, & Seniores ſcitis, &c.*

where againſt your own knowledge you tranſlate *Presbyteri* (Elders) to bleare the Readers eys, with a ſhew of a double ſort of Elders, whereas *Presbyteri* are there manifeſtly diſtinguiſhed from *Seniores*.

The place which you bring out of Saint Auſten *cōtra Creſconium Grāmaticum*, runs thus; *Omnes vos, &c.* All you Biſhops, Presbyters, Deacons, and Elders, do know, &c. where you

you ſee plainly that the Elders which hee means are below Deacons, and ſo you ſhall find them, whereſoever they are mentioned; now thoſe that you contend for, are by your own claime, in a Key above them. *Optatus* whom you cite is cleer againſt your ſenſe, whiles he makes only *quatuor genera capitum* only four ſorts of mē in the Church; *Biſhops*, *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, & the faithful (*Laity*) And in his firſt book againſt *Parmenian*, *Quid commemorē Laicos, &c.* he reckons up, meer *Laicks*, *Miniſters*, *Deacons*, *Presbyteros ſecundo ſacerdotio conſtitutos*, Presbyters in the ſecond degree of Prieſthood, *& principes omnium Epiſcopos*, and the chiefe of all Biſhops. Shortly, brethren, that there were in the Church of old ruling Elders, which were in a rank above Deacōs, and had together with the paſtors a ſetled power of governmēt, in the Church, it is an opinion no leſſe new, then unjuſtifiable; & I do here ſolemnly profeſſe, that if any one ſuch inſtance can be brought, I wil renoūce Epiſcopacie for ever. Do not thē, againſt the light of your own knowledge ſet a face on proofs of thoſe things, which never were, but give glory to God in yielding to ſo undoubted and cleer a truth.

Sect. XVI. XVII. XVIII.

THe reſt that remaines is but mere Declamation, not worthy of any anſwere, but contempt and ſilence; It is moſt true that the religious Biſhops of all times have ſtrongly upheld the truth of God againſt Satan and his Antichriſt.

What can you ſay to this? You tell mee of ſome irreligious ones, *that have as ſtrongly upheld Satan and his Antichriſt againſt the truth of GOD*; What is this to the calling? can not I tell you of ſome wicked and irreligious Presbyters, ſhall the function it ſelfe therefore ſuffer? You tel us *What an unpreaching Biſhop once ſaid of a Preacher*, I challeng you to ſhew any unpreaching Biſhop in the Church of *England* this day? it is your ſlander, this, not their juſt Epithete: the ſcandalls of our inferiour Miniſters, I profeſſe I could not but bleed to ſee, but withall deſired to have had them leſſe publique; your charity accuſeth mee of ex-

excuſing them, and blaming my humble motion of *Conſtantines* example, profeſſe to deſire the blazoning of them to the World; Whether of us ſhall give a better account of our charity to the God of peace, I appeale to that great Tribunall.

In your next Section, like ill-bred ſonns, you ſpit in the face of your mother, A Mother too good for ſuch ſonnes, The Church of *England*; and tell us of Papiſts *that dazle the eyes of poore people with the glorious name of the holy Mother the Church*, If they bee too fond of their Mother, I am ſure your Mother hath little cauſe to be fond of you; Who can and dare compare her to thoſe *Æthiopian* ſtrumpets, which were common to all commers; For your whole undutifull carriage towards her, take heed of the Ravens of the valley: As if wee were no leſſe ſtrangers, then you enemies to the Church of *England*, you tell the World *that wee know not who ſhe is; and that we wonder when wee are askt the queſtion*; and run deſcant upon the *two Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Convocation*; Even what your luxuriant wit ſhall pleaſe, and

and at laſt you make up your mouth with a merry jeſt, telling your Reader *that the Remonſtrant, out of his ſimplicity, never heard, nor thought of any more Churches of* England *then one*. *Ridiculum caput!* Sit you merry, Brethren but truly after all your ſport, ſtill my ſimplicity tells mee there is but one Church of *England*; There are many Churches in *England*; but many Churches of *England*, were never till now heard of; You had need fetch it as farre as the *Heptarchie*; And to ſhew how far you are from the objected ſimplicity, yee tell us in the ſhutting up, *that* England, Scotland, *and* Ireland, *are all one Church. Nullum magnum ingenium ſine mixtura dementiæ.*

But now take heed of Obelisks: You profeſſe, *you for your parts do acknowledge no Antiprelaticall Church*: I am glad to heare it, nor I neither, but I beſeech you, if you make and condemne a Prelaticall Church of *England*, what ſhall bee the other part of the Contradiſtinctiou?

The Remonſtrant tels you of further diviſions,

viſions, and ſubdiviſions, which upon this ground you muſt neceſſarily make of the Church, your deepe wiſdomes take this, as of his upbrading of the diviſions in the Church, in meer matter of Opinion, and fly out into the cenſures of the Prelaticall party, as the cauſe thereof; and would have them ſay, *Mitte nos in Mare, & non erit tempeſtas*; The truth is, the ſeveralties of Sects, and their ſeparate Congregations about this Citie are many and lamentable; I doe not upbraid, but bewaile them; The God of Heaven be Iudge where the fault reſts, and (if it bee his holy will) finde ſome ſpeedy redreſſe, but in the mean time, one caſts it upon faction, another upon ungrounded rigour, whereſoever it bee, *Woe bee to thoſe by whom the offence commeth*; Lay you your hands on your hearts onwards, and conſider well Whether your fomenting of ſo unjuſt and deep diſlikes of lawfull government have not been too much guilty of theſe wofull breaches.

As one that love that peace of the Church which

which you are willing to trouble, I perſwading an unity, ask what bounders you ſet, what diſtinction of Profeſſors you make, what grounds of Faith, what new Creed, what different Scriptures, Baptiſme, means of ſalvation are held by that part which you miſ-call the Prelaticall Church; You anſwer according to your wonted Charity, and Truth.

What bounds? *Thoſe* (you ſay) *of the ſixth Canon, from the high and lofty Promontory of Archbiſhops, to the Terra incognita of an &c.* Witty again. Alas, brethren, if this bee all, the Liſts are too narrow. Here are but four ranks of Dignities, and few in each; put if that incluſive, [&c.] reach far, yet what will you make of all this?

Doe you exclude Biſhops, Deans, Archdeacons, &c. from being members of the Church of *England*? ſure you dare not bee ſo ſhamefully unjuſt: If therefore, that they have an intereſt in the Prelacy, cannot exclude them for their intereſt in the Church: What becomes of your bounders? This is fit work for your Obelisk.

What

What diſtinction? you ſay, *worſhiping to the Eaſt, bowing to the Altar, proſtituting* (perhaps you meane proſtrating) *themſelvs in their approches into Churches:* and are theſe fit diſtinctions, brethren, whereupon to ground different churches? if they difference men, doe they difference Chriſtians?

What new Creed? you ſay, *Epiſcopacie by divine right is the firſt article of their Creed.* For ſhame brethren, did ever man make this an article of faith? who will thinke you worthy to have any faith given you in the reſt of your aſſertions? you adde; *abſolute and blind obedience to all the commandements of Biſhops;* Bluſh yet again, Bretheren, bluſh to affirme this, when you well know that the words of the oath of Canonicall obedience run only, *In omnibus licitis & honeſtis mandatis*, in all lawfull and honeſt commands.

You adde, *Election upon faith foreſeene*; What? nothing but groſſe untruths? Is this the doctrine of the Biſhops of *England*, have they not ſtrongly confuted it in Papiſts,

piſts, in *Arminians*; have they not cry'd it downe to the pit of Hell? What means this wickedly falſe ſuggeſtion? judge Reader, if here bee not work for Obelisks.

What Scripture? you ſay, *Apocrypha, and Traditions unwritten*; Mark I beſeech you, unwritten Traditions are Scriptures, firſt: then *Apocrypha*; and why, I pray you, is it more our *Apocrypha*, then yours? Are all our Bibles *Prelaticall* too? Shortly all thoſe Churches and houſes, and perſons that have the *Apocrypha* in their Bibles belong to the Church Prelaticall, what have wee loſt by the match.

What Baptiſme? What Euchariſt? You tell us *of the abſolute neceſsity which ſome Popiſh fooles have aſcribed to the one; and of an Altar and table ſet Altarwiſe in the other* What are theſe to the Church of *England*? doth the errour of every addle head? or the ſight or poſture of a Boord make a different Church?

What Chriſt? You anſwere, (near to a blaſphemy;) *A Chriſt who hath given the ſame power of abſolution to a Prieſt that himſelfe hath*

hath: This can be nothing but a ſlanderous fiction; No Chriſtian Divine ever held that a Prieſts power of abſolution was any other then miniſteriall, Chriſts Soveraign and abſolute. If you know the man bring him forth that he may be ſtoned.

What Heaven? you *ſay, ſuch as is receptive of Drunkards, Swearers, Adulterers*. Brethren, take heed of an Hel, whiles you fain ſuch an Heaven: and feare leſt your uncharitableneſs will no leſſe bar you out of the true Heaven above, then you bar Prelaticall ſinners from their acceſſe thereinto: but, if you had rather, goe on ſtill in your owne way, ſeparate your ſelves from us that profeſſe wee are one with you; Charge upon us thoſe doctrines and opinions which wee hate no whit leſſe then your ſelves, faſten upon the Church of *England* thoſe exoticall poſitions of unſound teachers, which it ſelfe hath in *terminis* condemned; and ſay as you are not aſhamed to do, *We thank God we are none of you*; we forgive you, and pray for your repentance.

Your Quæres, wherein I ſee you truſt much, are made up of nothing but ſpight and ſlander: If I anſwere you with queſtions ſhorter then your own, and more charitable, you will excuſe mee. In anſwer then to your firſt, I ask,

1 Who ever held the Lordſhips of Biſhops to ſtand by divine right. If no body, whether hee that intimates it doth not falſifie and ſlander? Why is it a greater fault in one of our Doctors to hold the Lords day to ſtand *Iure humano*, then it was in Maſter *Calvin*?

2 I aske whether it were any other then K. *Iames* himſelfe of bleſſed memory that ſaid, *No Biſhop, no King*; and if it were he, whether that wiſe King did not meane to prejudice his own authoritie?

3 Whether ſince it hath beene proved that Biſhops are of more then meerely humane Ordinance, and have ſo long continued in the Chriſtian Church to the great good of Church, and State, it be not moſt fit to eſtabliſh them for ever: and to avoid all dangerous motions of innovation?

4 Whether theſe anſwerers have the wit

or

or grace to underſtand the true meaning of the *Ius Divinum* of Epiſcopacie? or if they did, whether they could poſſibly be ſo abſurd, as to raiſe ſo ſenſleſs and inconſequent inferences upon it?

Whether there bee any queſtion at all in the fifth queſtion? ſince the Remonſtrant himſelfe hath ſo fully cleered this point, profeſſing to hold Epiſcopacie to bee of Apoſtolicall, and, in that right, Divine Inſtitution? 5

Whether Maſter *Beza* have not heard foundly of his diſtinction of the three kinds of Epiſcopacie, in the full and learned anſwere of *Saravia*: and whether hee might not have beene better adviſed then in that conceit of his, to croſſe all reverend antiquity: and whether the Painter that dreſt up his Picture after the fancy of every paſſenger, doe not more fitly reſemble thoſe, that frame their diſcipline according to the humour of their people, varying their projects every day, then thoſe which hold them conſtantly to the only ancient and Apoſtolicall forme. 6

Whe-

7 Whether it were not fit that wee alſo ſhould ſpeake as the ancient Fathers did, according to the language of their times; and whether thoſe Fathers could not better underſtand and interpret their owne meaning in the title of Epiſcopacie, then theſe partiall, and not over-judicious anſwerers; and whether they have not cleerely explicated themſelves in their writings, to have ſpoken properly and plainly to the ſenſe now enforced.

8 Whether Presbyters can with out ſin arrogate unto themſelves the exerciſe of the power of publique Church government, where Biſhops are ſet over them to rule and order the affaires both of them, and the Church; and whether our Saviour when he gave to *Peter* the promiſe of the Keyes, did therein intend to give it (in reſpect of the power of publike juriſdiction) to any other ſave the Apoſtles; and their Succeſſours the Biſhops; and whether ever any Father or Doctour of the Church till this preſent age, held that Presbyters were the Succeſſours to the Apoſtles, and not to the ſeventy Diſciples rather.

Whe-

Whether ever any Biſhops aſſumed to themſelves power Temporall to bee Barons, and to ſit in Parliament, as Iudges, and in Court of Star-chamber, &c. or whether they bee not called by his Majeſties writ, and royall authority to theſe ſervices; and whether the ſpirituall power which they exerciſe, in ordaining, ſilencing, &c. bee any other then was by the Apoſtles delegated to the firſt Biſhops of the Church, & conſtantly exerciſed by their holy ſucceſſors in all ages, eſpecially by *Cyprian*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine*, and the reſt of that ſacred order; men which had as little to do with Antichriſt, as our anſwerers have with charity. 9

Whether the anſwerers have not juſt cauſe to be aſhamed of patronizing a noted Heretick, *Aerius*, in that for which hee was cenſured of the ancient Saints, and Fathers of the Church; and whether the whole Church of Chriſt ever ſince his time till this age have not abandoned thoſe very errours concerning the equality of Biſhops and Presbyters which they now preſume to maintain. 10

Whe-

11 Whether the great Apoſtacy of the Church of *Rome* do, or did conſiſt in maintayning the order of government ſet by the Apoſtles themſelves; and whether all the Churches in the whole Chriſtian World (even thoſe that are profeſſedly oppoſite to the Church of *Rome*) doe let in Antichriſt by the doore of their Diſcipline, ſince they all maintain Epiſcopacie no leſſe conſtantly then *Rome* it ſelfe;

12 Whether if Epiſcopacie be (through the munificence of good Princes) honoured with a title of dignity, and largneſſe of revenues, it ought to be, ere the more declined and whether themſelves, if they did no hope to carry ſome ſway in the Presbytery would be ſo eager in crying up that govern ment; and whether if there were not maintenance annexed, they would not hid themſelves, and jeopard their eares rathe then mancipate themſelves to the charge o

13 ſouls.

Whether there bee no other appare cauſes to be given for the increaſe of Pope and ſuperſtition in the Kingdome, beſid

Epiſco

Epiſcopacie (which hath laboured ſtrongly to oppoſe it) and whether the multitudes of Sects, and profeſſed ſlovenlyneſſe in Gods ſervice, (in too many) have not bin guilty of the increaſe of profaneſſe amongſt us.

Why ſhould *England* one of the moſt famous Churches of Chriſtendome, ſeperate it ſelfe from that forme of government, which all Churches through the whole Chriſtian World have ever obſerved, and do conſtantly and uniformely obſerve and maintain; and why ſhould not rather other leſs noble Churches conform to that univerſall government which all other Chriſtians beſides do gladly ſubmit unto. 14

Why ſhould the name of Biſhops, which hath beene for this 1600. yeers appropriated (in a plain contradiſtinction) to the governours of the Church, come now to be communicated to Presbyters, which never did all this while ſo much as pretend to it; and if in ancient times they ſhould have done it could not have eſcaped a moſt ſevere cenſure. And ſhortly whether if wee will 15

allow you to bee Biſhops all will not bee well.

Whether ſince both God hath ſet ſuch a government in his Church, as Epiſcopacie, and the Lawes of this Land have firmly eſtabliſhed it, it can bee lawfull for you to deny your ſubjection unto it; and whether it were not moſt lawfull and juſt to puniſh your preſumption and diſobedience in framing ſo factious a queſtion?

And thus I hope you have a ſufficient anſwere to your bold and unjuſt demands, and to thoſe vain cavills which you have raiſed againſt the humble Remonſtrance.

God give you Wiſdome to ſee the Truth, and Grace to follow it, Amen,

To

To the Poſcript.

THe beſt beauty that you could have added to your diſcourſe, brethren, had been honeſty and truth both in your allegations of Teſtimonies, and inferences of argumentation; In both which I muſt needs ſay (and I ſpeake it in the preſence of God to whom I muſt ſhortly give an account) that I never ſaw any Writer that would dare to profeſs Chriſtian ſyncerity, ſo fouly to overlaſh; as if yee made no conſcience by what means you uphold a ſide, or win a proſelyte; God touch your hearts with a true ſenſe of that whereof you cannot be but in this diſcourſe convinced.

Now you thinke to garniſh your worke with a goodly *Paſquin* borrowed (for a great part) out of *Sion's Plea*, and the Breviate conſiſting of a rhapſodye of Hiſtories, *concerning the pride, inſolence, treachery, cruelty, and all other the deadlie ſins of popiſh prelates, but eſpecially of thoſe, who ſwayed the See of* Canterbury, *in thoſe days of Darkeneſſe and Re-*

niſh Tyranny. Whereto I ſuppoſe you expect no anſwere as being a thing utterly unconcerning us; and that, whereof I might ſay (ſetting aſide the ill intention of an application) as *Huntingdonienſis* ſaid of the Cardinals adultery, *Celari non potuit, negari non debuit*. But tell me brethren what can be your drift in this your tedious relatiõ? Is there any man that offers to undertake their patrocination? or is it any advantage to you to make their memory yet more odious? Let them have beene as foule as ill will can make them; Let them have been in their times Devills incarnate; what is that to us? *They were Biſhops* you ſay. True, but they were popiſh biſhops; limmes of that body, whoſe head wee abjure; the fault of their wickedneſſe was in the Popery, not in the Epiſcopacie, in the men, not the calling, why ſhould you think to choake us with theſe hatefull inſtances If I ſhould goe about to rake together all the inſolences, murthers, inceſts, treaſons, and villainies, that have beenedone by Popiſh Presbyters in the time of that lawleſſe ignorance, & ſuperſtition, would you think theſe could

could bee any blemiſh to you? why will you then bee ſo miſerably uncharitable, as to caſt upon us the crimes of thoſe whom we equally condemne, and to feoffe their faults upon their chaires? what one profeſſion is there in all mankind, which if wee ſhould go about to ranſack, would not yield ſome perſons extreamely vicious, ſhall the vocation bee condemned, for the crimes of the men? At laſt to make up the mouth of your admirable charity, You tell us *of the gracious practices of the Prelates from the beginning of Queene* Elizabets *Raigne to this preſent day; whoſe great deſigne,* you ſay, *ſtill hath beene to hinder reformation, to further Popery and Arminianiſme, to beat downe preaching, to perſecute zealous Profeſſors, and ſome ſuch other noble projects of Epiſcopall pietie*: Tell me Brethren, as you will anſwere it before the juſt Iudge of all the World; Have theſe beene the main deſignes of Biſhops? Are they all guilty of theſe wofull enormities, or are they not; If yee ſay they are, the World will cry ſhame on your falſhood; If they are not, the World will cry no leſſe

ſhame on your injuſtice, in taxing all for the fault of ſome: What? are theſe the onely remarkable works that your eyes could diſcover to fall from the hands of Biſhops? could you ſee no Colledges, no Hoſpitalls built? no Churches re-edified? no learned Volumes written? no hereſies confuted? no ſeduced perſons reclaimed? no hoſpitality kept? no great offenders puniſhed? no diſorders corrected? no good offices done for the publique? no care of the peace of the Church? No diligence in preaching? No holineſſe in living? Truly, brethren, I can ſay no more, but that the fault is in your eys, and not in your object: Wipe them, and looke better; Yea, I beſeech God to open them rather, that they may ſee good, as well, as evill.

As for that baſe and ſcurrilous Proverb, to which you ſay it is now comne (whereas the World knowes it is elder then your Grandſires, and was taken up, in the popiſh times) it were more fit for a *Scurra in trivio*, or ſome Ribald upon an Ale-bench, then for grave Divines.

How

How eaſie were it for mee to reckon up an hundred of ſuch ſpightfull Adages which vulgar envy hath beene wont to caſt upon the reſt of the Clergie, worthy of nothing but ſcorne? and ſo had this bin, if your wit and charity had not bin alike; But ſurely, Brethren, if whatſoever is ſpoiled, they ſay, *The Biſhops foot hath beene in it*; I doubt not but they wil ſay, *The Biſhops foote hath been in your Book*, for I am ſure it is quite ſpoiled by this juſt confutation. After your own pottage (for yonr Proverb *ſapit ollam*) you tell us of *Boner's broath*; I ſhould have too much wondred at this concluſion, but that I hear it is the faſhion in ſome Countries, to ſend in their Keal in the laſt ſervice, and this, it ſeems, is the manner amongſt our *Smectymnuans*.

Well; to ſhut up all, let them of their *Boners beef and broath*, make what Breweſſe they pleaſe for their credulous gueſts: Learned and worthy Doctor *Moulin* ſhall tell them, that the reſtauration of the *Engliſh* Church, and everſion of Popery, next under God, and our King, is chiefely to be aſcribed and

P. Moulin. Epiſt. 3. ad Epiſcop. Winton, &c.

and owed to the learning and induſtry of our *Biſhops*; ſome whereof being crowned with *Martyrdome*, ſubſcribed the *Goſpell* with their *blood*; Thus hee; Neither doubt I but that many of them (if occaſion were offered) would be ready to imitate them in thoſe red Characters.

In the mean time I beſeech the God of Heaven to humble you in the ſight and ſenſe of your own grievous uncharitableneſſe, and to put (at laſt) into your hearts and tongues, the Counſels of Peace.

FINIS.

An Advertiſement to the READER.

KNow Reader, that whereas in one of thoſe many angry Pamphlets, which have beene lately publiſhed, there is an intimation given of ſome diſgracefull language that fell from Dr. Voetius, the learned profeſſor of Vtrecht, concerning the perſon of Doct. Hall B. of Exeter; there hath been ſerious inquiſition made into the truth of that report; and that the ſaid D. Voetius diſavowes (to the party that inquired of it) any ſuch words of under-valuation, by him ſpoken, as it is teſtified under the hand of Sir William Boſwell Knight, his Majeſties Lieger with the ſtates: And, if, upon the ſight of a diſpleaſing title of a Booke (contrary to his own

judgement) any learned Divine, ſhould have paſſed a cenſure upon the worke; there was ſmall reaſon for the reporters to reflect upon the perſon of the authour. Yea, I am confident that many of our worthy brethren at home, who are differently minded concerning this tenet of the right of Epiſcopacie, if they would be pleaſed to informe themſelves throughly of the ſtate of the queſtion, as it is defended by the Authour of that treatiſe, would find ſmall cauſe of ſcruple in this opinion. For whereas there are three degrees of truths, and holy inſtitutions (as they are commonly diſtinguiſhed) Humane, Apoſtolike, Divine; The firſt from mere men; The ſecond from men Apoſtolical; The third from God himſelfe immediately; The Authour deſires to goe a Mid-way in this difference; holding it too low to derive Epiſcopacy from a merely humane, and Eccleſiaſticall Ordinance; holding it too high to deduce it from an immediate command from God; and therefore pitching upon an Apoſtolicall inſtitution; reſts there: but becauſe thoſe Apoſtles were divinely inſpired, & had the directiõs of Gods ſpirit for thoſe things which they did for the common adminiſtration of the Church, therefore, and in that onely

name

name is Episcopacie *said to lay claime to a Divine right; howsoever also it cannot be gainsaid that the grounds were formerly laid by our Saviour in a knowne imparity of his first agents; Now surely this truth hath so little reason to distaste them, that, even learned* Chamier *himselfe can say;* Res ipsa cœpit tempore Apostolorum, vel potius ab ipsis profecta est. *And why should that seeme harsh in us, which soundeth well in the mouthes of lesse-interessed Divines? but because the very title of that book hath raised more dust then the treatise it selfe; Bee pleased, Readers, to see, that this very question is in the very same termes determined by that eminent light of the* Palatinate; *Dr.* Abrah. Scultetus; *whose tract to this purpose I have thought fit to annex.*

Peruse it, and judge whether of those two writers have gone further in this determination; And if you shall not meet with convincing reasons to bring you home to this opinion; yet, at least-wise find cause enough to retaine a charitable and favourable conceit of those, who are (as they think, upon good grounds) otherwise minded; and whilest it is on all parts agreed by wise and unprejudiced Christians, that the calling is thus ancient and

ſacred; let it not violate the peace of the Church to ſcan the originall, whether Eccleſiaſticall, Apoſtolicall, or divine. Shortly, let all good men humbly ſubmit to the Ordinance, and heartily wiſh the Reformation of any abuſes.

And ſo many as are of this mind, Peace be upon them, and the whole Iſraell of GOD.

AMEN.

The

THE DETERMINATION of the queſtion,

Concerning the *Divine Right* of *EPISCOPACY.*

By the famous and learn'd Divine Dr. *Abrahamus Scultetus*, late Profeſſour of divinity in the Vniverſity of *HEIDELBERG.*

Faithfully tranſlated out of his Obſervations upon the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus.*

LONDON
Printed for NATHANIELL BVTTER. 1641,

LONDON
Printed for NATHANIEL BUTTER. 1641.

The Queſtion.

Whether Epiſcopacie be of Divine right ? *That is, whether the Apoſtles ordained this Government of the Church, that not onely one ſhould be placed over the people, but over* Presbyters *and* Deacons, *who ſhould have the power of Impoſition of Hands, or Ordination, and the direction of Eccleſiaſticall Counſels.*

THis was anciently denyed by *Aerius*, as is related by *Epiphanius*, in his 75 Hereſie, and by *Iohn* of *Hieruſalem*, as appears by *Hierome*, in his Epiſtle to *Pammachius*. And there are not wanting in theſe dayes many learned and pious men, who, although they acknowledge *Aerius* to have erred

erred, in that he ſhould diſallow of that manner of Eccleſiaſticall government, which had beene received by the whol World; yet in this they agree with him, that Epiſcopall government is not of Divine Right. From whoſe opinion why I ſhould ſever my judgement, I am moved by theſe ſtrong reaſons, famous examples, and evident authorities.

My judgement is this;

Firſt, in the *Apoſtles* Epiſtles the name of *Biſhop* did never ſignifie any thing different from the office of a *Presbyter*. For a *Biſhop*, *Presbyter*, and an *Apoſtle*, were common names, as you may ſee *Act.* 20. *Phil.* 1. *v.* 1. *Tit.* 1. 1. *Pet. v.* 12. *Act.* 1. 20.

Next. In the chiefe Apoſtolicall Church, the Church was governed by the common advice of *Presbyters*; and that for ſome yeers in the time of the preaching of the *Apoſtles*. For firſt of all, companies muſt bee gathered together, before we can define any thing concerning their perpetuall government.

Then, the *Apoſtles*, as long as they were preſent or neere their Churches, did not place any *Biſhop* over them, properly ſo called, but only *Presbyters*, reſerving Epiſcopall authority to themſelves alone.

Laſtly, after the *Goſpell* was farre and neere propagated, and that out of equality of *Presbyters*, by the inſtinct of the Devill, *Schiſmes* were made in Religion, then the *Apoſtles* (eſpecially in the

the more remote places)placed ſome over the Paſtors, or Presbyters, which ſhortly after, by the Diſciples of the Apoſtles, *Ignatius*, and others, were onely called biſhops, & by this appellation, they were diſtinguiſhed from Presbyters & Deacons.

Reaſons moving me to this opinion: Firſt, *Hierome* upon the 1. Chapter of the Epiſtle to *Titus*, writeth, *that a Presbyter is the ſame with a Biſhop, and before that, by the inſtinct of the Devill, factions were made in Religion, and it was ſaid among the people, I am of* Paul, *I of* Apollo, *but I of* Cephas, *the Churches were governed by the common counſell of Presbyters: afterwards it was decreed in the whol world, that one choſen out of the Presbyters, ſhould be placed over the reſt.*

From whence I thus argue.

When it began to be ſaid among the people, I am of Paul, *I of* Apollo, *but I of* Cephas, *then one choſen out of the Presbyters*, was placed over the reſt.

But whiles the Apoſtles lived, it was ſo ſaid among the people. As the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, beſides other of St. *Pauls* Epiſtles, puts it out of doubt. *Therefore, while the Apoſtles lived, one choſen out of the Presbyters was placed over the reſt.*

Againe, There can be no other terme aſſigned, in which Biſhops were firſt made, then the time of the Apoſtles; for all the prime ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles were Biſhops: witneſſe the ſucceſſions of Biſhops in the moſt famous Churches of *Hieruſalem*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Rome*, as it is in *Euſebius*, therefore, either the next ſucceſſors

ceſſors of the Apoſtles, changed the force of Eccleſiaſticall government, received from the Apoſtles, according to their owne pleaſure, which is very unlikely, or the Epiſcopall government came from the Apoſtles themſelves,

Beſides, even then in the time of the Apoſtles, there were many Presbyters, but one Biſhop, even then in the time of the Apoſtles, ὑπεροχὴ, hee that was placed over the reſt, which afterwards was called Biſhop, did impoſe hands, or ordaine Miniſters of the Word, which Presbyters alone did not preſume to doe. Even then, therefore, the calling of Biſhops was diſtinct from the Office of Presbyters.

If any deſire the examples of Apoſtolicall Biſhops, the books of the antient are full of the Epiſcopal authority, of *Timothy* and *Titus*, either of which, howſoever, firſt performed the office of an Evangeliſt, yet notwithſtanding, ceaſed to be an Evangeliſt, after that *Timothy* was placed over the Church of *Epheſus*, and *Titus* over the Church of *Crete*; For Evangeliſts did only lay the foundations of faith in forraign places, & then did commend the reſt of the care to certaine Paſtors, but they themſelves went to other Countries, and Nations, as *Euſebius* writes in his third Booke of Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory, and 34. Chap. But *Paul* taught ſometimes in *Epheſus* and *Crete* and laid the foundations of Faith there; therefore he commandeth *Timothy* to ſtay at *Epheſus*, & *Titus* at *Crete*, not as Evangeliſts but as governors of the Churches.

And

And indeed, the Epiſtles, written to either of them, doe evince the ſame; for in theſe, he doth not preſcribe the manner of gathering together a Church, which was the duty of an Evangeliſt, but the manner of governing a Church, being already gathered together, which is the duty of a Biſhop; and all the precepts in thoſe Epiſtles, are ſo conformable hereunto, as that they are not refer'd in eſpeciall to *Timothy*, and *Titus*, but in general to all Biſhops, and therefore in no wiſe, they ſuit with the temporary power of Evangeliſts.

Beſides, that *Timothy* and *Titus*, had Epiſcopall juriſdiction, not onely *Euſebius*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Theodoret*, *Ambroſius*, *Hierome*, *Epiphanius*, *Oecumenius*, *Primaſius*, *Theophylact*, but alſo the moſt ancient writers, of any that write the Hiſtory of the new Teſtament, whoſe writings are now loſt, do ſufficiently declare: *Euſebius* without doubt appealing unto thoſe, in his third book of Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory and 4. chapter, *Timothy* (ſaith hee) in Hiſtories is written to bee the firſt which was made Biſhop of the Church of *Epheſus*, as *Titus* was the firſt, that was made Biſhop of the Church of *Crete*.

But if *John* the Apoſtle, and not any antient Diſciple of the Apoſtles, bee the authour of the Revelation, hee ſuggeſts unto us, thoſe ſeven new Examples of Apoſtolicall Biſhops: For all the moſt learned Interpreters interpret the ſeven Angels of the Churches, to be the ſeven Biſhops of the Churches; neither can they doe otherwiſe,

unleſſe they ſhould offer violence to the text.

What ſhould I ſpeake of *James*, not the Apoſtles but the Brother of our Saviour, the Sonne in law of the Mother of our Lord: who by the Apoſtles, was ordained Biſhop of *Hieruſalem*, as *Euſebius*, in his 2d. book of Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory, & 1 chap. out of the 6. of the *Hypotypoſes* of *Clement*, *Hierome* concerning Eccleſiaſticall writers, out of the 1. of the Comments of *Egeſippus*, relate, *Ambroſe* upon the 1. chap. unto the *Galatians*, *Chryſoſtome* in his 23 Homily upon the 15 of the *Acts*, *Auguſtine* in his 2d. book and 37 chap. againſt *Creſconius*, *Epiphanius* in his 65, Hereſie, The 6. Synod in *Tullo*, and 32 Canon, all aſſenting thereunto. For indeed, this is that *James* that had his firſt reſidence at *Jeruſalem*, as an ordinary Biſhop, whom *Paul* in his firſt, and laſt coming to *Hieruſalem*, found in the City; almoſt all the Apoſtles preaching in other places, *Gal.* 1. 19. and that concluded thoſe things, which were decreed in the aſſembly of the Apoſtles, *Act.* 21. For hee was with *Chryſoſtome* Biſhop of the Church of *Hieruſalem*, from whom when certaine came, *Peter* would not eate with the Gentiles. *Galat.* 2. 12.

From examples, I paſſe to authorities, which *Ignatius* confirmes by his own authority,

Whoſe axiomes are theſe.

The Biſhop is he, which is ſuperiour in all chiefty, and power. The Presbytery, is a holy company of counſellours, and aſſeſſours to the Biſhop. The deacons are the imitators of angelicall vertues, which ſhew forth their pure, and unblameable miniſtry. He which doth not obey theſe, is without

God,

God, impure, and contemnes Christ, and derogates from his order, and constitution, in his Epistle to the *Trallians.*

In an other place, *I exhort that ye study to doe all things with concord. The Bishop being president in the place of God. The Presbyters in place of the Apostolick Senate, the Deacons as those to whom was committed the Ministry of Jesus Christ,* in his Epistle to the *Magnesians.*

And againe, *Let the Presbyters be subject to the Bishop, the Deacons to the Presbyters, the people to the Presbyters and Deacons,* in his Epistle to those of *Tarsus.*

But *Ignatius* was the Disciple of the Apostles, from whence then had he this Hierarchie but from the Apostles?

Let us now heare *Epiphanius* in his 75. Heresie. *The Apostles could not presently appoint all things: Presbyters and Deacons were necessary; for by these two, Ecclesiasticall affaires might bee dispatcht. Where there was not found any fit for the Episcopacie, that place remained without a Bishop, but where there was need, and there were any fit for Episcopacy, they were made Bishops. All things were not compleat from the beginning, but in tract of time all things were provided which were required for the perfection of those things which were necessary, the Church by this means receiving the fulnesse of dispensation.*

But *Eusebius* comes neerer to the matter, & more strongly handles the cause, who in his third booke of Ecclesiasticall History, and 22: chapter, as also in his Chronicle affirmeth *that* Erodius *was ordained the* 1. *Bishop of* Antioch in the yeere of our Lord 45. in the 3. yeere of *Claudius* the Emperor

ror: at which time, many of the Apoſtles were alive. Now *Hierome* writeth to *Evagrius*, *that at* Alexandria, *from* Mark *the Evangeliſt, unto* Heraclius *and* Dioniſius *the* Biſhop, *the Presbyters called one, choſen out of themſelvs, and placed in a higher degree, the* Biſhop. But *Marke* dyed, as *Euſebius*, and *Bucholcerus* teſtifie, in the yeere of our Lord 64. *Peter*, *Paul*, and *John*, the Apoſtles, being then alive: therefore, it is cleere, that Epiſcopacie was inſtituted in the time of the Apoſtles, and good *Hierome* ſuffered ſome frailty, when he wrote, that *Biſhops were greater then Presbyters, rather by the cuſtome of the Church, then the truth of the Lords diſpoſing*; unleſſe perhaps, by the cuſtome of the Church, hee underſtands the cuſtome of the Apoſtles, and by the truth of the Lords diſpoſing, hee underſtands the apointment of Chriſt, yet not ſo, hee ſatiſfies the truth of Hiſtory. For it appears out of the 1. 2. and 3. Chapters of the *Revelation*, that the forme of governing the Church by Angels or Biſhops, was not only ratified, and eſtabliſhed, in the time of the Apoſtles, but it was cõfirmed by the very Son of God. And *Ignatius* called that form the order of Chriſt.

And when *Hierome* writes, *that it was decreed in the whole World, that one choſen out of the Presbyters ſhould bee placed over the reſt.* And when I have demonſtrated, that in the life-time of the Apoſtles, Biſhops were ſuperior to Presbyters in Ordination: and that each Church had one placed over it, doe wee not without cauſe demand; where, when, and

and by whom Epiſcopacie was ordained? Epiſcopacie therefore is of divine right. Which, how the Prelates of the Church of *Rome*, for almoſt 300. yeers, did adorne with the truth of Doctrine, innocency of life, conſtancy in afflictions, and ſuffering Death it ſelfe for the honour of Chriſt; and on the other ſide, how in ſucceeding times, firſt by their ambition, next by their exceſſive pragmaticall covetouſneſſe, ſcraping up to themſelves the goods of this world, then by their hereſie, laſt of all by their tyranny they corrupted it, that the *Roman Hierarchy*, at this day, hath nothing elſe left but a vizard of the *Apoſtolicall Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchy*, and the lively image of the whore of *Babylon*, our Hiſtories both antient and moderne doe abundantly teſtifie.

Wherefore all Biſhops are warned from hence, that they throughly weigh with themſelves the nature of Apoſtolicall Epiſcopacie, of which they glory that they are the ſucceſſors.

That Epiſcopacie had two things peculiar to it, the privilege of ſucceeding, & the prerogative of ordaining: all other things were common to them with the Presbyters. Therefore both Biſhops and Presbyters, ſhould ſo exerciſe themſelves in godlineſſe, ſhould ſo free themſelves from contempt by their converſation, and ſo make themſelves examples to their flock; not neglecting eſpecially the gift of prophecying, received from above, but being wholly intent, to reading, conſolation, and teaching: to meditate

on

on theſe things, to be wholly converſant in them; and ſo perpetually imployed in this holy function, and divine affairs, with this promiſe, that if they ſhall doe theſe things, they ſhall both ſave themſelves, and their Auditors, but if after the cuſtome of ſome great ones, they follow the pride and luxury of this World, they ſhall both deſtroy themſelves, and them that heare them.

(*)

FINIS.

THE JUDGMENT OF

The learned Divine, Doctor *Abrahamus Scultetus*, prime professor of Divinity at *HEIDELBERGE*,

Concerning *Lay-Elders*.

OBSERVATIONS Vpon 1 *Timothy*, by *Abraham Scultetus*. Cap. 27.

Concerning 1. *Tim.* 5. 17.

THere are some that thinke this place of Scripture is of force enough to make good a Lay-Presbytery: for their eyes and judgements are dazled with that distinction of Elders, which they suppose, to be cleerly intimated here by S. *Paul*: But, if they shall have diligently scanned

the place, & compared it with other Texts of Scripture, they ſhall ſoone finde that the defence of Lay Eldersout of this place, is both contrary to the ſignification of the Word (πρεσβῦτες) *i e.* thoſe that rule, and contrary to the ſignification of the Word Presbyter; and that it is quite againſt St. *Pauls* perpetuall Doctrine, and it is againſt the judgement of all the Fathers, that have expounded this ſpeech of Saint *Paul*.

It is contrary to the ſignification of the Word (πρεσβῦτες) for (πρεσβεία) or Eccleſiaſticall rule or government is an honour wherewith onely Miniſters of Gods word are inveſted in the new Teſtament, and not any Lay Perſons: We beſeech you brethren ſaith the *Apoſtle*, 1 Theſ. v. 12. *That you know thoſe that labour among ſt you, and are over you in the Lord, and that admoniſh you, and to eſteeme them very highly in love for their workes ſake: upon which words, ſaith* Calvin, *it is worthy to bee obſerved; what titles he gives to Paſtors.* Firſt he ſaith, that they labor, and then he ſets them forth, by the name of rule, or governance. And *Beza* upon the place it appeares from hence, *that the Church was governed by Paſtors in common, and that the degree of a Biſhop was not thought of, and therefore* (πρεσβῦς) *to rule, is the ſame with* (ἡγεῖσθε) *to leade, becauſe the ſhepheards are wont to goe before their flock.* But the Apoſtle *Heb.* 13. 7. and 17. *calls the Miniſters of the Word Leaders.* Therefore, according to *Beza*, we muſt acknowledge thoſe that are over the people, are the Miniſters of the word: neither doth *Iuſtin Martyr*

in

in his Apology to *Antonius* call the (πρεσβυτερα) any other then the paſtor and teacher of the Congregation.

Moreover, the defence of Lay-Elders out of this preſent text of St. *Paul*, is contrary to the ſignification of the word Presbyter, which when it is uſed, concerning the polity of the new Teſtament, doth always ſignifie the Miniſters of the word: *Acts* 11. 30. They ſent their collection to the Elders by the hands of *Barnabas*, and *Saul*, that is to the Miniſters, of whom it is ſaid, *Acts* 14. 23. χειροτονήσαντες δὲ They ordained them Elders in every Church: And *Acts* 15. 2. A main queſtion of faith is propounded to the Apoſtles and Elders of *Hieruſalem*; but what? to be decided by Lay-Men? for the Elders met with the Apoſtles to conſider of this matter, *Acts* 15. 6.

And the Presbyters are joyned together with the Apoſtles *Verſe* 22. and are diſtinguiſhed from the whole Church, as alſo *v.* 23. and *chap.* 16. 4. Again in the 20. of the *Acts* the Elders of *Epheſus verſe* 17. are ſaid to be made Biſhops to feede the flocke of *Chriſt*, *ver.* 18. and in *Acts* 21. 18. and the verſes following, the Presbyters or Elders of *Jeruſalem* inſtruct the Apoſtle *Paul* what he is to doe; and therefore were no Lay-men. In this very Chapter, when *Timothy* is commanded to receive no accuſation againſt an Elder, the Elder there is a teacher, as ſhall be ſhewed in the next chapter. *Titus* 1. 5. that thou maiſt ordain Elders in every City: what kind of Elders? ſurely, teachers; for hee adds, if

any be blameleſſe. &c. for a Biſhop muſt be unreproveable, &c.

And *James* 5. 14. The ſick are bidden to ſend for the Elders of the Church, that they may pray over, and anoint the ſick with oyle in the name of the Lord, which is no Lay-mans duty: 1 *Peter* 5. 1. The Elders I exhort who am alſo a fellow-Elder, feede the flock; How is hee a fellow-Elder, but becauſe he is a teacher as they?

And they are charged to feed the flook, therefore Paſtors, 2, *Iohn* 1. & 3 *Iohn*, 1, *Iohn* the Apoſtle without all queſtion is called an Elder. *Ignatius* makes often mention of Elders, or Presbyters in his Epiſtles, but never of Lay-Elders. And in his Epiſtle to thoſe of *Tarſus* deſcribing the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchy of his time, he ſaith (οἱ πρεσβύτεροι) Let the Presbyters bee ſubject to the Biſhops, and the Deacons to the Presbyters, and the Lay-men to both Deacons, and Presbyters: and to the *Magneſians* As the Lord ſaith hee doth nothing without the Father: ſo neither do you without your Biſhop, neither Presbyter, nor deacon, nor Laick. Where obſerve that the very Deacons did not ſit in the Presbytery Apoſtoliq;, much leſſe Lay-men.

Thirdly, the defence of Lay-Elders out of the 17. *verſe* of *Chap.* 5. of the 1. *Tim.* is againſt the Perpetuall doctrine of St. *Paul*: for to give honour to the Presbyters, or Elders, is to honour them with maintenance, out of the publique ſtock of the Church; for ſo the Apoſtle, before, commands thoſe that are indeed Widowes to be honoured,

that

that is to be deſigned to publique attendances and allowances; And the reaſon which the Apoſtle gives, confirmes this explication of the honour required; When he ſaith thou ſhalt not muzzle the Oxe that treadeth out the corne. And in *Matthew* the honor of Parents is chiefely to be taken of meat and maintenance, which ſignification is very familiar and proper to the word (*Kabud*) uſed in the fifth commandement, and ſo the word is expounded by *Marke* 7. 12. But maintenance, out of the ſtock of the Church, the Apoſtle would not have to be given even to ſuch poore widdows, as could be otherwiſe provided for; as before *verſe* 16. And he himſelfe laboured with his owne hands, that he might not bee burdenſome to others, much leſſe would he have the chiefe of the Laity who abound with wealth to bee maintained of the common ſtore; and that more liberally then others: For, if by thoſe that rule well, you ſhall underſtand both Lay-Elders and ſacred alſo, you muſt needs conclude, that they are all worthy of double honour, both thoſe which rule, and thoſe which labour in Doctrine: which concluſion the Apoſtle is againſt elſewhere; whileſt hee ſaith, thoſe which ſerve at the Altar, muſt partake of the Altar. And the Lord himſelfe who hath appointed that thoſe which preach the Goſpell ſhould live of the Goſpell, 1. *Corinthians* 9. 13. 14. Whereupon *Hierome* in the ſame place; hee would ſaith hee, have them to yeeld carnall things to thoſe

of

of whom they receive ſpiritual things, becauſe they being taken up in teaching, cannot provide neceſſary things for themſelves. Yea, I ſay yet more, if St. *Paul* had, by thoſe that rule, underſtood Lay-elders, certainly hee would ſome-where have put them in minde of their duty, or, at leaſt have made mention of them, 1 *Tim.* 3. where he doth not omit to give charge even of Deacons, and Deaconeſſes: But he doth neither of the two, but preſently after the mention of Biſhops, or *P*resbyters that were *Pa*ſtors, he falls into the ſpeech concerning Deacons, and their wives; ſo as it is a plaine proofe that Lay-Elders were utterly unknown to him.

Fourthly, the defence of Lay-Elders out of this place is utterly againſt the judgment of the fathers, ſo many as ever have expounded this text of the Apoſtle: Neither indeed is there any neceſſity at all, that becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, thoſe eſpecially that labour in Word and Doctrine, therefore we ſhould deviſe new Elders to bee taken out of the common people: For it was well knowne, that thoſe of the Clergie, which are over the Lords flock, have their diſtinct Offices, and employments. There are of them, which adminiſter Sacraments, make publike prayers, privately admoniſh faithfull people, and with-hold them from ſinning; there are others, which being indued with excellent guifts of ſpeaking, imploy themſelves in being teachers & guids to mens ſoules in the way to heaven, and the labors of theſe men, which are taken by them, in word and doctrine

Doctrine, are juſtly preferred before the ſervice of them, which adminiſter the ſacraments, and make prayers for the Church; even by the teſtimony of the Apoſtle himſelfe, who ſaith; *Chriſt ſent me not to baptize, but to preach the Goſpell*, 1. Cor. 1. 17. *He was ſent for both purpoſes*, but the chief end of his miſſion, was, the preaching of the Goſpell.

Whoſoevertherefore, thus rule the people, whether they doe adminiſter the Sacrament, or onely preach the word, or whether they doe both, are worthy of double Honour; where a certain number is put for an uncertain, double honour, that is greater and more then others; although ſome are of opinion, that here by Apoſtoliq; authority there is a greater portion aſſigned to the Governours, then to others that appertain to the Church, others interpret it of that double Honour which is fit for governours to have; one, of an awfull reverence and command, the other of more largeneſſe of maintenarce; that they be, both, obſerved, and reſpected above others, and, that they have a more liberall proviſion of neceſſaries for their livelyhood; but the firſt of them is the more ſimple expoſition of the words. He therefore holds thoſe, that are ſet over the people worthy of double honour; And why double? A little before he had given them order about the honoring, that is maintaining of their Widowes, at the charge of the Church: from the Widows, hee paſſeth to the Elders, or Presbyters; whom, if they rule well, hee would have honoured with a double alowance, that

that is greater then that of the Widowes, both by reaſon of their office, and by reaſon of their family; and amongſt thoſe that rule, yet againe, hee would have thoſe moſt regarded, who are imployed not ſo much in adminiſtring the Sacraments, as in preaching the Word. I doubt not but this is the moſt true Explication of this place

FINIS.